

QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOLUME I.

Edited by
ELIZUR WRIGHT, JUN.

NEW-YORK :
PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
No. 3 Spruce Street.

M.DCCC.XXXVI.

NEW-YORK:
WILLIAM S. DORR, PRINTER,
123 Fulton Street.

CONTENTS.

No. I., for October, 1835.

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ABOLITION OF SLAVERY BY GREAT BRITAIN, By C. Stuart.....	3
The vincibility of prejudice proved by facts, 4, 5.—Republics the most ferocious slaveholders, 5.—Decline of the feudal system in Britain, 6.—Sir John Hawkins, leader in the slave trade, 7.—Origin of Slavery, 7.—Slavery legalized in England, 7.—First motion for the abolition of the trade in the House of Commons, 8.—Wilberforce, 9.—Decisive vote, 11.—Elizabeth Heyrick, 13.—Canning's Resolutions, 14.—London Anti-Slavery Society, 15.—Flogging of women in Jamaica, 16.—Colonial arrogance, 17.—Mischief of "Expediency," 18.—The theory that Christians were only to <i>care for the souls</i> of the slaves, 19.	
III. SLAVERY TESTED BY ITS OWN CODE, By William Goodell.....	21
Assumed right of property, 23.—Denial of God's moral government, 23.—Specific acts of legislation infringing religious privileges, 24.—Prohibits virtue and compels vice, 26.—Is theft, robbery, plunder, piracy, man-stealing, 27.—No real protection for slaves, 29.—Inferences, 32.	
IV. A REVIEW—THE PRINCIPLES OF REFORM, By Beriah Green.....	34
[Art. X. On Political and Ecclesiastical Reform. Lit. & Theol. Review, No. VI.] The aim of the Reformer, as stated by Mr. Woods, 36.—The necessity of reform, 37.—The work of reform identical with the business of doing good, 38.—The enemies of reform responsible for the horrors of revolution, 38.—Mr. Woods' distinction between the offices of religion and of reform, 39.—A dialogue, 40.—The arrogance of conservatives rebuked, 42.—Illustrations—Temperance, 44.—Emancipation, 45.—Radicalism, 47.—Gradualism, 49.—Mr. Woods <i>vs.</i> Jeremiah, 51.—Relation of Americans to American institutions, 55.—Mr. Woods' maxim, 57.—Particular evils, how treated by the Savior, 59.—History of Reformers, 61.—Methodist leaders, 63.— <i>Pliability</i> of modern religion, 66.—Trials to be expected by the friends of the oppressed, 67.	
V. THE HARMONY OF MOSES AND THE APOSTLES, By Rev. Samuel Crothers..	68
The disbelief of a harmony between the Old and New Testaments on the subject of slaveholding a common species of infidelity, 69.—Brief analysis of the law of Moses, 71.—The moral law considered, 72.—The judicial law, 78.—The ceremonial law, 80.	
VI. PRO-SLAVERY TESTIMONY EXAMINED, By the Editor.....	92
Authority of the master absolute—Testimony of Edwin C. Holland, Esq. 93.—of Hon. Whitmarsh B. Seabrook, 93.—Actual treatment—Testimony of R. J. Turnbull, Esq. 94.—Tasks, 95.—Subsistence, 96.— <i>Fear</i> the only motive, 97.—Testimony of Thomas S. Clay—Food, 98.—Clothing, dwellings, work, 99.	
FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE, British West Indies.....	100
ADVANCE OF THE ABOLITION CAUSE	102
TO THE READER.....	104

No. II., for January, 1836.

I. ABOLITION OF SLAVERY BY GREAT BRITAIN, By C. Stuart, (Concluded)·	107
The London Society discards gradualism in 1830, 107.—Anti-Slavery Reporter—Lecturing—first tried in Ireland—Agency sub-committee formed—Lectures in England—George Thompson, &c. 108.—Violence of the slaveholders in Jamaica, 109.—Results of the insurrection, 110.—Missionaries driven off, 111.—Inquiry in the House of Lords—Lord Suffield—Com. of inquiry at the same time in the Commons, 111.—The final struggle—Deputation of 331 to London—Stanley's plan, 112.—Compromise, 113.—Apprenticeship—Antigua and Bermuda, 114.—New society organized, 115.—Anecdote of Mrs. Stumbles and her emancipated slaves, 116.	

II. PRO-SLAVERY TESTIMONY EXAMINED, By the Editor, (Concluded.) . . . 117

Mr. Clay—Encouragement and regulation of Marriage, 117.—Treatment of animals by slaves, 118.—Self government of slaves—Crimes against the master more severely punished than those against God, 119.—Absurdity of punishing slaves for immoralities—*Civil offences* punished on the plantations, 120.—*Letting alone* when his task is done, the highest encouragement to the slave, 121.—Economy of the slave system—Testimony of Seabrook on the physical and moral condition of the slave, 122.—No regard paid to the rights of the slave, 123.—Subordination, punishment's, stocks, &c. 125.—Unrestrained intercourse, 120.—Sympathy of slaves for each other—Religious instruction—*Oral* instruction, 128.—Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, 130.—Repugnance of the slaveholders to all valuable instruction, 132.

III. AGRICULTURAL CODE OF ST. DOMINGO, From the Testimony of T. F. Buxton, Esq. in the House of Lords. 133

Rules Cotemporaneous with the decree of Emanipation in St. Domingo—the earliest agricultural code, 133.—Freedom of laborers recognized, 134.—Cultivation for shares, 135.—Classification of laborers—terms of labor, 136.—Duties of overseers and laborers, 137.—Penalty for *striking* a laborer—Penalties for neglect of labor, &c. 138.—Rules for day-laborers, 139.—Wages—Jurisdiction of Justices of the peace—publication of the ordinance, 140.—Effects of these rules, 140, 141.—Revision of the code, 141.—Encouragement of marriage, 142.

IV. A REVIEW—THE ELEMENTS OF MORAL SCIENCE, By the Editor. . . . 143

[*The Elements of Moral Science.* By Francis Wayland, D. D. &c.]

The will of the Creator the ground and rule of duty, 144.—Philosophy of Paley, 145.—Dr. Paley undermines the Scriptures, 146.—Characteristics of Dr. Wayland's work.—Sophisms overthrown by his positions, 147.—Doctrine of consequences, 148.—Basis of Human Rights, 150.—Dr. Wayland attacked by the Southern Baptist, 152.—Sophistry on the Bible argument borrowed from Paley, 154.—Ground on which the Slave is commanded to obey his master, 155.

V. RADICALISM—IN REPLY TO THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, By Beriah Green 156

An index to public sentiment, 166.—Mr. Woods' picture of reformers, 157.—"They condemn institutions when they should only condemn abuses," 158.—Contrast between Mr. Woods' Reformer and Radical, 160.—Hooker and the non-conformists, 160.—Hooker and Walter Travers, 163.—Dialogue between a Priest and Levite, 166.—Quotation from Bishop Hall, 168.—Coleridge's opinion of Slavery, 163.—Mr. Woodc instructed how to put down Radicals.

VI. A REVIEW.—LEGISLATION AGAINST LIBERTY.—ANTI-REPUBLICAN EDUCATION, By William Goodell. 171

[I. *Letters against the immediate Abolition of Slavery*, &c. By T. R. SULLIVAN. With a legal opinion on the powers of Legislatures, &c. By WILLIAM SULLIVAN, LL. D. II. *The Political Class Book*, By WILLIAM SULLIVAN, Counselor at Law, &c.]

The country more favorable than the city to Anti-Slavery effort, 172.—Anti-Slavery can be put down only by law, 172.—Female influence, 173, 174.—Concession of rights, 176.—Popular excitement, combination, 177.—Temperance ultras, 178.—Inconsistency of the Pro-Slavery Advocate, 179.—Anti-Slavery and Temperance reformation founded on the same principle, 180.—Apology for European despotism, Legal opinion, 181.—The gag law proposed, 182.—Divinities of the constitution, 182.—Attack upon democracy, aristocracy recommended, Church and State, 186.—Government a machine for regulating the people's rights, 187.

VII. STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES' SLAVE POPULATION, By the Editor 188

Slavery destructive to life, 188.—Table of slaves, free white, and free colored population, 189.—Transfer of slaves from northeast to southwest, 190.—Disturbance of the natural state of population in regard to age, 191.—Longevity of slaves compared with free colored, 192

VIII. TEXAS, By David Lee Child. 193

Emigration to Texas, privileges of the emigrants, 193.—Revolt premeditated. Gradual abolition of slavery in Mexico, 194.—Evasion of the law. Complete ab-

olution, 195.—Convention at St. Felipe de Austin—Austin's mission to Mexico, 196.—Imprisonment of Austin.—Boundary question.—Poinsett sent to Mexico, 197.—Gen. Jackson endeavours to gain Texas.—Intrigues of Poinsett, 198.—Account of the domestic slave trade, 199.—Southern press, Benton and Houston, 201.—Effect of the acquisition of Texas upon the price of slaves, 202.—Land speculation, 203.—Cause of the revolt.—Indians, 204.—Prospect of a war with Mexico, 205.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE, British Colonies..... 205
Hands employed on plantations in Antigua fewer but more effective, 206.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS, Dr. Channing's Book, *Memoirs of Granville Sharp*..... 207

SUMMARY OF EVENTS..... 207

No. III., for April, 1836.

Distinction between politics and religion brought in defence of slavery, 209.

REMARKS ON PROFESSOR DEW'S VINDICATION OF PERPETUAL SLAVERY, By Wm. Jay, Esq..... 211

Massacre at Southampton.—Deliberations of the Virginia Legislature, 211.—Misfortune of the Professor.—Slavery ancient, 212.—Origin of slavery.—Laws of war, 213.—Humanizing influence of slavery, 214.—Second source, State of property. Third source, Bargain and sale, 215.—Fourth source, Crime, 215, 216. Fifth source of slavery not mentioned by Dew, *Robbery and Violence*, 217.—Kidnapping—sixth source—not mentioned by Dew—*Robbery by virtue of Law*, 218.—Selling men under authority of Congress to pay jail fees, 219.—Advantages of slavery to civilization, 219.—Taming savages, elevating the female sex, 220. Colonization.—Emancipation without deportation, 222.—The relative amount of labor before and after emancipation, 223.—Serfs of Poland, Livonia, and Hungary—Emancipation will excite plots, &c. 224.—Morality of slavery, the last topic of Dew, 225.—Moral effect of slavery upon slaveholders, 226.

II. OBJECTIONS TO ABOLITIONISM TESTED BY THE AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, By William Goodell..... 227

Objectors "as much opposed to slavery as any body," "slavery a great evil," "but the measures," 227.—Definition of slavery, 228.—"Vituperation, abusive epithets, slander," 229.—Wrong manner.—Slaves should be first prepared, 230.—Danger of Emancipation, 231.—Slaves would be no better off, would starve, 232.—"give us your plan," 233.—Turning loose—slaves would overrun us, 234.—Compensation, 255.—Emancipation would ruin the masters, 236.—No right to interfere—Constitutional guaranty, 237.—Will divide the Union, 238.—Excitement, 239.

III. "THE HORRORS OF ST. DOMINGO, By the Editor..... 241

Perversion of facts—difficulty of obtaining truth, 241.—Bryan Edwards—his calumny of Lafayette, 242.—Classification of horrors—Insurrection—cause assigned by Edwards—true cause, 243.—Tyranny, rapacity and licentiousness of the slave holders—importation of Africans—oppression of the mulattoes, 244.—Narrative of Edwards, 245.—White colonists avail themselves of the French revolution to vindicate *their own rights*—their deputies to Paris—mulattoes there—white colonists exasperated at the Declaration of the National Assembly—death of Ferrand de Beaudierre—Colonial Assembly, 247.—Vacillating policy of the National Assembly—colonial contest between republicanism and royalism, 248.—Affairs of Oge, 249.—His terrible death—Confession, 250.—Effect of this barbarity in France—Decree of the 15th May, giving citizenship to all the free born—rage of the whites—arming of the mulattoes, 251.—Insurrection of the 23d August—Confined to the slaves—Concordat—Reflections—Story of Oge, 252.—No action on the slaves by the mulattoes, 253.—Another account of Oge.—His letter to the president of the Assembly at the Cape, 254.—The slaves excited by the cruelties of the whites—cases of atrocity, 256.—Statements of an American lady, 257.—Perfidy of the whites, 258.—Rescinding of the decree of the 15th May—Mulattoes thrown into coalition with the slaves—Cruelties—Abbe Gregorie's letter, 259.—"Horror of Emancipation" have nothing to do with the insurrection—Citizenship again extended to mulattoes and free negroes by the National Assembly—Commissioners sent out, 260.—Quarrel between the Commissioners and Gov. Galbaud—the former call in the aid of the revolted negroes, 261.—Slaughter at

the Cape—Galbaud driven to the United States, 262.—Interference of the British, 263.—*Emancipation* by Polverel—Concurred in by the planters, 264.—Effects of the measure—testimony of Malenfant, 265.—of La Croix and Vincen', 267.—Causes to be taken into account in estimating the effect of this emancipation—Exports before and after, 268.—Laborers before and after, 269.—Protection of white planters by Toussaint—"Horrors of the Code Rural," 270.—Success of the codes of Polverel and Toussaint attributed to *coercion*, 271.—The mistake—true reason of a "military guard," 272.—Dissatisfaction and intrigues of the planters—their indirect testimony in favor of Toussaint, 273.—The discovery of the "coercion" of the Code Rural first made in 1826—a pro-slavery forgery, 274.—American editors trumping up a similar fraud in 1834—Commercial Advertiser—Mr. Hibbert, 275.—Culled extracts from the Code Rural, 276.—Review of the Code Rural, 277, 282.—Obligation of the people to industry, 277.—Landmarks, boundaries, irrigation, &c.—Contracts for labor, 278.—Division of the proceeds—absence—tools, 279.—Care of the sick—of infants—obligations of cultivators—method of terminating differences between proprietors, cultivators, &c. 280.—Breeding farms—care of animals—Rural Police, 291.—Penalties—authority by which the code was enacted, 282.—Code Rural compared with English laws, 283.—"The horrors of idleness"—Statements of James Franklin, 284.—The decay of the old establishments no proof of the idleness of the present population—new system of distribution of the public lands, 285.—Reason for the scarcity of laborers—Cultivation changed from the plains to the mountains, 286.—Extracts from a traveler in Hayti, in 1830—scenes in a Haytian market—health and appearance of the people, 287.—Use of asses—cultivation of the mountains—irrigation, 288.—Mode of cultivation—many crops on the same ground—cottages—small sugar farms, 289.—Trade with the Bahamas—market people—Port au Prince—city of the Cape, 290.—Chateau Blond—a large sugar estate, 291.—Steam machinery—mulcture paid for the use of machinery—arrangement for supplying the deficiency of labor—*Conducteurs* appointed by the laborers themselves, 293.—Domestic habits of the people, 294.—Dumornay Bellevue, another sugar estate—comfort of the laborers, 295.—M. Senator L'Espinasse—his sugar refinery—his character, 296.—Produce of a large sugar estate—preference given to agriculture over a military life, 297.—Authenticity of the traveller quoted from—inconsistency of Franklin, 298.—Reason of diminished exports—more products consumed at home—Testimony of Robert Sutherland and Admiral Fleming, 299.—"The horrors of desolation"—Inquiry whether the sum total of them are not to be attributed to slavery itself, and the mad resolution of the French to re-establish *property in man*, 300.—Good conduct of Toussaint—interference of Bonaparte—his motives—Expedition of Le Clerc, 301.—Massacre at the bay of Mancenille—hypocrisy of Le Clerc—perfidy towards Toussaint—re-establishment of slavery—vengeance of the people—vengeance of God—death of Le Clerc—Rochambeau succeeds—his illimitable atrocities—his bloodhounds—those rapacious brutes hugged, garlanded, and *kissed* by the wives of the white planters, 302.—Civil wars after the expulsion of Rochambeau—education encouraged, 303.—Success of the republic—Testimony of Mackenzie—Commerce, 304.—Population—Indemnity to France, 305.—Clarkson's statements in regard to Oge—Sentiments of Judge Marshall, 306.—Conclusion, 307.

WHITEFIELD AND THE SLAVEHOLDERS 307
Letter of Alexander Garden, 308.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE *Letter from Antigua* 309
SUMMARY OF EVENTS 311

No. IV., for July, 1836.

The Chain and Cartwhip policy of the United States—Protection applied to the breeding of human cattle, 313.—Enlargement of the market—Sacerdotal oppressors, 314.

I. INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY ON SLAVEHOLDERS 315
—Slavery begets a character favorable to its own continuance, 315.—Contrast between the slaves and their masters—the relative situation of the two classes the result of violence, 316.—The system cuts off sympathy—places the slave on the footing of a brute, 317.—Arbitrary power over brutes is often abused to great cruelty—Man still more likely to excite man's passions, 318.—Coercion the ne-

cessary consequence of the tenure—the necessary inflictions harden the master's heart—familiarity with suffering tends to the same result, 319. The process of hardening the slaveholder's heart begins in childhood, 320. A forced relation can give rise to no reciprocal duties—its effects not confined to the intercourse of master and slave, 321. Slaveholders are inevitably driven to regard the slaves as an inferior race—less than men, 322. Driven to other false pleas—to a self-deceptive dishonesty, 323. Other actions soon brought to the test of the false and wicked morality of slaveholding—effects on those who act in defiance of their convictions still worse, 324.—Guilt in proportion to light, 325.—Indolence of the slaveholder, 326.—Light of *facts*, 327.—Effect upon general morals illustrated in the case of the Georgians and Cherokees, 328.—Influence of an immense mass of ignorance and degradation, especially upon children, 329.—Burke's opinion, 330.—The character of slaveholders, if nothing else, makes it our duty morally to interfere, 332.

II. LETTER TO A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL, By Beriah Green.....333

Exclusion of the subject of slavery from the pulpit, based on the injunction of Paul, 333.—The interpretation which would confine the Christian teacher to a narrow circle of topics at variance with the practice of the apostle in this very epistle, 334.—The true aim of the apostle was against the subtleties of false rhetoric—he was for the progress of the gospel as distinguished from false philosophy—not from good morals, 335.—He viewed all subjects of human interest in the light shed by the cross of Christ.—In this light his injunction should teach us to view the subject of slavery—meaning of *salvation*, 337. Absurdity of piety without humanity—saintship without manhood, 338.—Course of Christ and his apostles—rebukers of the proud—friends of the poor, 339.—Case of the priest going to Jericho—the Savior's representative on earth—the hungry, ragged, sick, oppressed stranger, 340.

III. SLAVERY AND ITS ECCLESIASTICAL DEFENDERS, By the Editor.....341

[Dr. Channing on Slavery, and his Reviewers, in the *Christian Spectator* and *Biblical Repertory*.]

Two classes of clerical opposers, 341. Advantages of Dr. Channing's position—his weapons wasted for want of aim, 342.—Agitation—Dr. Channing's account of its effects, 343.—"Thousands of the best of men" compelled to sympathize with slaveholders—*Christian Spectator*, 344.—The value of abolitionists who sympathize with slaveholders, 345.—*Christian Spectator* disproves its own theory—Simplicity and ignorance of a great man, 346.—Not the manner but the matter of abolition which exasperates the South—lamentations of the *Biblical Repertory*, 347.—Controversy between the *Repertory* and *Christian Spectator*, 348. The *Repertory's* account of Anti-Slavery publications, 349.—Difference of circumstances between our country and England, 350.—Southern exasperation, 352.—The propriety of addressing the people of one country against the oppression of those in another, 354. The *Repertory's* grand pro-slavery argument—its definition of slavery, 355.—Absolute ownership of the slaveholder, 356.—Deceptiveness of the Reviewer's definition, 357.—Meaning of the word *servant* in the New Testament, 358.—No proof that slavery existed in Judea—Differences of circumstances between that time and the present, 359.—Were slaveholders received to the communion by the Apostles? 360.—Exegesis of 1 Tim. vi. 1, 361.—Difference between ancient and modern slavery, 363.—The Reviewer assumes without proof, that slaveholders were in the primitive church, 364.—Christ and his apostles not slaveholders, but laboring men—community of goods—success among the poor rather than the rich, 365.—The trouble that would inevitably have followed the admission of slaveholders—supposed letter of some slaveholders to Paul, 366.—Case of Philemon, 367.—Primitive church free from participation—not so the American, 368.—Mischief done to true religion by the reviewer, 369.—His denial of natural equality—his hypocritical opposition to slavery! 370.—The General Assembly has made itself responsible for this sin, 371.—Public course of Christ and his apostles, by analogy, if placed in our circumstances, 376.—This point made clear by the Reviewer himself, 373.—Slavery the idolatry of this nation, 374.

IV. LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF A FUGITIVE SLAVE, Reviewed by the Editor 375

[Slavery in the United States: A narrative of the life and adventures of Charles Ball, &c.]

Comparison of real with fictitious narrative, 375.—Plan of the narrative under review, 376.—Disinterested character of the work, 377.—Manner of chaining and driving slave-coffles, 378.—Feelings of the slave when sold from his family, 379.—Gaiety of slaves, 380.—Description of slaveholders in Maryland and Virginia, 381.—Pride and poverty of Virginia slaveholders—their motives for wishing the extension of the slave market—Texas, 382.—A small-fry slaveholder, 383.—Chains filed off—slave whip, 384.—Flogging of a woman—a slave's child, 385.—Religious privileges of slaves, 386.—Mahomedanism, 387.—Superstition—Sunday on a plantation, 388.—Wages scrupulously paid on Sunday, 389.—Things in Georgia—Description of a slave mistress whose slaves pitied her husband, 391.—Perils of escape, 392.

ON ABSTINENCE FROM THE PRODUCTS OF SLAVE LABOR, By the Editor..... 393

Gerrit Smith's resolution—importance of the question, 393.—Statement of the argument—act of purchase does not imply approbation—does not always encourage the particular mode of production, 394.—Effect of total abstinence on the Anti-Slavery cause 395.—An objection answered—products of Slavery not exactly stolen goods 396.—Direction of the apostle on intercourse with transgressors—how far and for what reason we ought to abstain—abstinence in England, 397.—Sympathy for the slave should govern—danger of *physical* expedients, 398.—Beet sugar—inadequacy of physical arguments, 399.

JUDGE LAWLESS vs. LAW By the Editor,..... 400

Necessity of an unquestioned supremacy of law, 400.—Monarchy compared with Republicanism in this matter, 401.—Dangers of Mob Law—Sword of justice now formally surrendered to the mob by Judge Lawless, 402.—Burning alive of Mc Intosh—*Aldermen* of St. Louis participate, 403.—Charge of the Judge—finding of the Grand Jury 404.—Mc Intosh suffered for his *complexion* 405.—All protection of colored men and their friends surrendered 406.—Violation of the Constitution 407.—North and South compared in regard to observance of the compact, 408, 409.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE,..... 409

British West Indies 409—Despatch of the Marquis of Sligo 410, 411.—Dr. Madden 412.

STATISTICS OF SLAVERY. Letter from John Farmer, Esq..... 412

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,..... 414

Trial of Crandall.—Songs of the Free 414.—Godwin's Lectures.—Utica Riot.—Lectures of George Thompson, 415.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS..... 416

Anti-Slavery—Free State Legislation—Congressional—Arkansas, Texas, 416

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. I.

OCTOBER, 1835.

NO. 1.

INTRODUCTION.

FRIENDS AND COUNTRYMEN. The holders of slaves in this republic cry out with one consent, '*The Immediate Abolitionists must be put down.*' Doubtless they *must*, or Slavery must be relinquished. Terrible systems of injustice may go forward smoothly, so long as *truth* can be kept under lock and key. But the troubler is abroad. She has whispered in the years of thousands what they cannot forget. She has asked some hard questions about the "names of things." Is the man who takes your watch, without your consent, a thief or a robber, or what is he? 'Amen,' say the people 'he is any thing but honest and honorable.' Well, if he had cut deeper in his process, and taken with the watch the owner—the bird, nest and all—what then? Here, in a nutshell, is the whole issue upon which depends the destiny of one sixth part of our nation. Truth has hinted a *name*.—Avaunt there, say the tribe of conservatives, we have nothing to do with your logic or your abstractions, we look at the *consequences*. Whether a man is to be called a *thief* or a *robber* depends upon the *consequences*. If you push this question and urge the analogical answer, making slaveholders consummate adepts in conduct which usually falls under the denomination of villany, you jeopard the public safety, *you sunder the Union*—nay, you put the abolition of slavery itself at a hopeless distance.'

But the question recurs, What is the slaveholder doing? What is the real nature of that relation which he sustains to the fellow man whom he calls his slave? Name it as you will, how does it *compare* with one of those acts of *theft or robbery* which is commonly punished as such?

The slaveholder must be set down somewhere. If he is set down among honest and praiseworthy men, we shall no doubt have peace with him, but will he mend his ways? Verily not. Why should he? If you set the slaveholder among honest men, while he is really the most flagrant violator of human rights, you are guilty of *falsehood*, and falsehood never produced a reformation. On the other hand, if you place him where he belongs, whether you reclaim *him* or not, you prevent others from imitating his example. Let this never be forgotten.

But the exasperation of slaveholders is a slender argument against the efficacy of *truth*. The word of Jesus exasperated the demoniacs, but it brought out the devils. Why are the slaveholders enraged? Because they know that when the seeds of Abolition, which are now scattered, spring up in a full expression of public sentiment, the disgrace of their practice will cost more than the profit. Were it otherwise they would notice us only by a laugh. They fear no attacks upon their persons, nor unconstitutional interference with their claims, nor additional inducements to rebellion held out to the slaves, but that the world will become *abolitionists*;—in which event slavery will be found less tolerable to the master than to the slave.

We have no fondness for dealing in hard names. We do not insist upon applying to slaveholders the epithets *thieves and robbers*. But in reasoning on the guilt of slaveholding we must of necessity resort to comparison. We must compare the practice with acknowledged violations of human rights, and judge of it accordingly. The relation in which it stands to theft or robbery is infallibly detected by an easy

comparison. A is a slave who has in his pocket \$500 to pay for his freedom. B meets him and takes away half the money. Which does him the greater injury? B who takes \$250, or the master who withholds what the slave values at more than \$500? Yet B is a robber and a cruel one, for he robs a poor man of that on which depends his *liberty*.—But the *circumstances* and the *consequences* are brought up to justify the master,—why not to justify B.

The reader needs not be told that this Quarterly Magazine has been established to promulgate the view of American slavery here presented, and if possible to brush away from before the eyes of the American people that veil which has prevented their seeing it in the full odiousness of its principle and the worse horrors of its practice. Should we succeed in this arduous undertaking, we shall only have effected what would take place spontaneously to-morrow, should a miracle, to-night, reduce the *complexion* of our countrymen to one homogeneous tint. Such a transformation would bring self-interest to the aid of conscience and benevolence, against a system from which the white non-slaveholder now supposes himself protected by the hue of his skin.

ON THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY BY GREAT BRITAIN.

BY C. STUART.

“Men of little genius and great bodily strength, are by nature destined to serve, and those of better capacity to command—wherefore the *nations of Greece* and some other countries*, being naturally superior in genius, have a natural right to empire; and the *rest of mankind*, being naturally stupid, are destined to labour and slavery.”—Aristotle, *De Republ.* Lib. I. Cap. 5, 6.—(Note, when Aristotle wrote this, our *white* ancestors were the merest barbarians, living in caves and hollow trees.)

“If they have been any considerable time in slavery, they appear lost to reason and to feeling—their spirits broken, and their faculties sunken in a species of stupor, which I am unable to describe. They appear degraded even below the negro slave. The succession of hardships, without any protecting law to which they can appeal for alleviation or redress, seems to destroy every species of exer-

* Observe, the Greeks are *colored people*, and must always have been such.

tion or hope in their minds. They appear indifferent to every thing around them, abject, servile and brutish."—Mr. Dupuis, British Consul at Mogadore (Morocco,) speaking of *whites* in slavery, under the Moors.

"The same principle ("Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself") which binds the Christian *most disinterestedly*, to forgive all personal injuries and insults, obliges him, *as disinterestedly*, to oppose every degree of injustice and oppression, whenever he has a fair opportunity—and hence arises the zeal of good men for just and equitable laws, as being the most effectual means, of preserving the peace and happiness of the community, by curbing the insolence and malice of wicked men.—Granville Sharp, Law of Passive Obedience.—London, 1776.

The mutability of human feeling, even when most intense, and apparently most unchangeable, is *as remarkable a fact of human nature*, as the utter dogmatism, with which, in the blindness of its own elation, it protests that it can never change.

A child, delighted with something in you that has won it, thinks in the ardor of its affections, that it will love you forever. Presently, it discovers, that you are not altogether what it supposed; new objects attract its attention, and it loves you no more. Nor is this fickleness at all confined to infancy—it eminently pervades the seasons of youth and early manhood—and in different degrees accompanies our later years.

The patricians of Republican Rome, spurned the plebeians—and felt that civil war was preferable to allowing them the fair and equal rights of men—nor need we wonder—for Republican Rome had no Bibles; no Ministry of Christ, to teach them better and holier things. But the patricians and plebeians of Rome, gradually became a united people.

The nobles and their vassals in England were separated by barriers as mighty—and centuries upon centuries, strengthened the original corruption, on which the separation rose. But the nobles and vassals in England, have long since been blended into one people! all alike enjoying, under the protection of equal laws, the inalienable rights of mankind, "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

The castes of Hindostan are as inveterate as evil customs can be; but the castes of Hindostan, are melting before the preaching of the Gospel. Thousands of the Brahmins and of the lowest of the outcasts there, have returned to the holy brotherhood of man.

In St. Domingo, in 1790, the whites preferred rebellion, to yielding to the free colored people of the Island, the civil rights, in part restored to them, by the French national go-

vernment. In 1793, the republican whites of St. Domingo, not only had gladly allowed their fullest rights to the free colored people, but proclaimed "*Immediate Emancipation*" to the whole body of the slaves, as the only means of safety and happiness, for themselves and country.

Ten years ago, the West Indian whites grown old in iniquity, spurned all civil equality, with the free colored people—and felt as rootedly as wickedness ever has done, that the separation must be eternal. Six years ago, as if by magic, (blessed be God, *His* hand was in it,) the Jamaica Legislature, the proudest, mightest, sternest of them all, led the way, and the free colored people throughout the island, almost immediately, had their righteous equality in law restored to them.

In all these cases, and in ten thousand others, the lie of the "*Eternity of wicked customs*"—of the "*invincibility of brutal prejudices*," has been swept away. In the United States, it still lingers—but it is "*in articulo mortis*," it is at its last gasp—it dies hard, for it has had a giant's strength. But the long, long night of despotism and of prejudice, is coming to an end—the morning star has arisen—the day of law has dawned. Truth is rising with healing in its wings; and the pride, and the selfishness, and the ferociousness, and the cowardice, and the cruelty, which for nearly six thousand years have made man fatten the earth with his poor brother's tears and blood, are going to have written over them:

ICHABOD.—Their glory (their hateful day of sin and shame,) is departed!

Republics, when *slaveholders*, have always been the most ferociously and proudly tyrannical. Witness Athens, Sparta and Republican Rome in *ancient* times. In *modern*, witness Holland and the United States, and until recently, the republican kingdom of Great Britain; amongst people called *Christian*, Protestants, in the capacity of slavemasters, are decidedly the worst! The reasons probably are, 1st. That despotic governments have but *one* great tyrant—but *republican* despotisms, have *ten thousand*: and 2d. The higher a man's profession is, the more corrupt he becomes, when breaking thro' the restraints which it imposes, he converts it into a covering for iniquity. *Besides*, the despot who rules a nation, is further removed from that personal collision of bad pas-

sions, which most engenders crime. But the despot who rules or manages a plantation, is brought day by day, into immediate contact, with all that can develope the unjust, or excite the cruel, or ensnare the impure passions of our nature.*

The history of Great Britain is full of instruction on this subject. It shews us the extent and malignity of the evil *which we are contemplating*; it opens our eyes to the cruel and destructive delusions, which have sheltered it; and it sets before us the nature and means of its remedy.

In the beginning of the seventeenth century, Great Britain was comparatively free. Her barons were losing their terrible grasp—her cerfs were recovering their unforfeited manhood—her feudal system was sinking to extinction—her authorities were yielding to the world-enlightening, the soul-reviving truth, that "*man is man*" and that "*no man is more.*"

But Britain was an eager aspirant after power and wealth, and Britain was successful; and Britons yielded, like other men to the corrupting influences of prosperity. In her march to empire, she planted colonies, and her colonies partook of their parent's spirit. Happy, indeed, if in their

* JEFFERSON in his "Notes on Virginia," Philad. 1792—2d Edition—speaks powerfully the simple truth of nature on this subject.

"The whole commerce between Master and Slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions. The most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it—for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave, he is learning to do, what he sees others do.—If a parent could find no motive, either in his philanthropy or in his self-love, for restraining the intemperance of his passions towards his slaves, it should always be a sufficient one, that his child is present. But generally, it is not sufficient. The parent storms—the child looks on—catches the lineaments of wrath—puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves—gives a loose to his worst passions—and thus nursed, educated and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it, with odious peculiarities. The man must be a *prodigy*, who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances.

"And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who permitting one half of the citizens, thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms *those* into despots, and *these* into enemies—destroys the morals of the one part and the "*Amor patriæ*" (patriotism) of the other."

And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed their only firm basis, a *conviction in the minds of the people, that these liberties are the gift of God!* that they are not to be violated, but with His wrath. Indeed I tremble for my country, when I reflect that *God is just*—that His justice cannot sleep forever—that considering numbers, nature and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune—an exchange of situation, is among possible events—that it may become probable, by supernatural interference! *The Almighty* has no attribute which can take sides with us, in such a contest." pp. 237, 238.

maturity, when no longer dependant, they had outstripped her in repentance, as they had followed her in sin.

In the midst of her progress to liberty at home—Britain plunged into the foreign slave trade—or, rather, *some British speculators* did so, carrying the government along with them; first by misrepresenting the nature of the traffic; and *subsequently*, by commercial influence. Sir John Hawkins, a thorough pirate, was the leader in this atrocious pursuit, in 1556 or 1562, deceiving Elizabeth, who was probably but too willing to be deceived. The nation, that is, the body of the people, *the British mind*, never entered into the abomination.

For some time, this pirate portion of British merchants, continued to make themselves the felon-drudges of foreign guilt—but the colonies not long after planted, presented too tempting a field to be overlooked, and Britain became a slave holder as well as a slave trader. In this fearful guilt, all the British settlements, properly called "*colonies*" partook; that is, *all the British settlements* to which settlers resorted from England, with the view of *planting new states*, nurtured their avarice, their indolence and their pride, excepting Pennsylvania, for a season, by slavery and slave-trading—and this they did, not because they were Britons, or West Indians, or Americans, but because they were *men*.

In the British West Indies, this horrible system began in St. Kitts, in 1623; and in the continental colonies, a few years earlier; in Virginia, 1619. For nearly 200 years, it continued without remorse or impediment. Oh, what floods of tears—what streams of blood—what mortal agonies, have recorded their cry before the throne of Jehovah, against it! When "*He maketh inquisition for blood,*" *will* He not "*remember them.*" "*Can He forget the cry of the humble?*"—Psalms xix. 12.

In 1729, slavery had reached such a climax in the colonies, and colonial influence had attained such a height in the empire, that the slave faction was enabled to get it *legalized in England*, abhorrent as it was to the British character, and *contrary as it was to British law*—(see Memoir of Granville Sharp, by C. Stuart;) and for nearly half a century it continued to pollute the British shores.

In 1772, it was abolished in England; and in the same year, a feeble attempt was made, by petitions, against its

offspring, the *African slave trade*, in several colonies, both insular and continental; but this retention at the same time of slavery, its great *parent*, discredited their petitions; and the demand for slaves being thus kept up by themselves, would have rendered the *legal* abolition of the trade in a great measure inoperative, even had their petitions prevailed. Granville Sharp thus pours light upon the subject, in his "Law of Retribution," London 1776—page 305.

"The inhabitants of Great Britain, and the inhabitants of the colonies seem to be almost equally guilty of oppression. The colonies protest against the iniquity of the slave trade, but nevertheless continue to hold the poor wretched slaves in a most detestable bondage! Great Britain, indeed, keeps no slaves; but publicly encourages the slave trade, and contemptuously rejects or neglects every petition or attempt of the colonist against that notorious wickedness."

Conscience, however, on these subjects, was wakening to sleep no more!

The British mind could not remain long at rest, under the guilt thus palmed upon it, by its government and its colonies. In 1776, Mr. David Hartley, member for Hull, moved, in the House of Commons, "That the slave trade, is contrary to the laws of God, and to the rights of man;" and Sir George Saville, seconded the motion.

In 1787, more systematic measures were commenced in London, for the abolition of the African slave trade. Wilberforce and Clarkson, supported by Granville Sharp, being the leaders. Granville Sharp, indeed, vehemently urged the attack of the *parent* evil, *slavery*, at the *same time*; but his friends, daunted by the aggravated power of the opposition which they would have to encounter, should they do so, shrunk from the contest; fondly, tho' *groundlessly* believing, that *cutting off a branch*, would *extirpate the root*; that the supply could be arrested, while the demand remained.*

* If any one should yet be dubious on this subject, let him look at the United States. As above mentioned, in the year 1772, being then dependent upon England, they petitioned for the *abolition* of the *supply*, still keeping up the *demand*. They soon after became *independent*, having fought for "*liberty*," and conquered. What did they do? In the first settlement of their Constitution, 1787, they secured the *supply*, (the African slave trade,) *from* abolition, for twenty-one years, or until 1808. In 1808, they proceeded to abolish *legally* the supply, as far as depended upon the African slave trade. But was the African slave trade *actually abolished*. Not at all! It continued for several years, almost as vigorous, as if no law had

In the year 1789, Wm. Pitt introduced a bill against the African slave trade into Parliament, and Wm. Wilberforce, who had been prevented taking the first step, by sickness, upon his recovery, pursued it with ardour for several years. The slave faction fought a desperate battle, as all other staunch and impenitent sinners do. They pleaded that the negroes were an inferior race—that the condition of slaves in Africa was exceedingly miserable—they told of the cruelty of the African despots, and declared that the slaves prepared for market, would be murdered if not purchased. They pretended that the stock could not be kept up without new importations. They attempted to prove, that the commerce in slaves, was necessary to the prosperity of the nation. They predicted ruin should it be abolished. They insisted upon the impossibility of its abolition by England alone, since other nations would continue it. They predicted disaffection and insurrection in the colonies. They dwelt upon the distress to which it would expose the planters. Mr. Stanley, agent for the islands, said, that “it appeared to him to be the *intention of Providence, that one set of men should always be slaves to another.*” Alderman Watson pleaded for it, because if there were not slaves in the West Indies, the inferior kind of codfish supplied by the Newfoundland fishery, could not be disposed of; and if the bad fish could not be disposed of, the fishery could not be sustained—and if the fishery were to fail, the nation would be ruined! Lord Sheffield foretold a civil war “on the day on which the bill

been even thought of, against it, till at length its *piratical nature* was acknowledged, and human law declared it to be “felony” as God’s law had always done. But did the *supply* (or the *trade*) cease, because the *branch* was thus *wounded*? Not at all. The African slave trade, tho’ much maimed, is not *yet*, actually at an end in the United States. Still, 3,000 or upwards of *New Africans*, are yearly smuggled into Louisiana, &c.: and what the wounded branch, cannot yield, this *internal slave trade*, amply and *legally* supplies. To trade in *Africans*, is *felonious*! to trade in *Americans* is *lawful* and *right*!! horrible anomaly; and to cap the climax, the *right* secured to Congress by the Constitution, of *regulating* the commerce of the States, is loudly denied to the Congress, by the *proudest vociferators* for the Constitution. And why?—simply because when there is a demand, avarice and corruption will secure a supply, at whatever risk of danger, or expense of duty. The United States are here particularly selected for illustration, because in *other* respects, the United States are the first of people in liberty and light. If rectitude could ever be expected, it might be expected from them. Free, powerful, enlightened, unburthened, a terror to many, and in fear of none, they are blessed surpassingly with every advantage to make the path of duty as easy, as it is plain, and to lead them away with utter abhorrence and contempt, from tyranny and pride. Yet they are *slaveholders*, and, of course, *slave traders*. Pride, avarice and lust fabricate slavery—and slavery produces the slave trade. Unrelenting corruption perpetuates the demand—and corresponding corruption supplies it. Such

should pass into a law." The danger of discussing the question in Parliament, was vehemently urged. The incapacity of Parliament to legislate on the subject, was strenuously asserted. *Our critical situation at this moment, and the peculiar difficulties just now in our way*, were always at hand. Of "*by and bys*," and *amelioration*, and *gradualism*, there was sufficient. Liverpool was bewailed, and the loyal people who would fly to America, should the slave trade be abolished. The certainty of smuggling, was foretold by Lord Castlereagh; and he also inveighed against the imprudence of the abolitionists, for not doing things "*in a more business-like way*," and for going to *extremes*! he wished to see "*some fair, intelligible, practical mode*, laid before the House." General Gascoigne quoted Scripture to support the trade; and declared that the length of its continuance, ought to perpetuate it; but should it be abolished, he insisted upon compensation. Sir W. Young objected to the bill because he anticipated the emancipation of the slaves, as an inevitable consequence, and he reminded the abolitionists of the "charity" which they owed the slave dealers and slaveholders. Mr. Rose declared his *reprobation* of the trade; but lamented the *necessity* of opposing its abolition, from the *particular manner*, in which it had been brought forward. Lord Sidmouth admitted that the slave trade was unjust and inhuman; but insisted, that it was neither inhuman nor unjust to continue it—he "would permit the slave trade to continue for a while, in order to mitigate its horrors, that being, as I conceive," (*he conceived*), "the most likely way to accelerate

is man! What are his brother's rights, or his brother's blood, when standing in the way of his corruptions armed with power. They are the tyrant's scoff. Yes. The land of bibles, and churches, and revivals—the land of religious tracts, Sunday schools, and temperance societies. The missionary land, which sends the gospel to the nations. The great Republic, that deems itself *eminently* free, and holds an anniversary of *Liberty*!! with all the pomp of power, and with all the self-gratulations of *magnanimity*, solemnly enacts that *one slave trade is felony*! and *another is lawful and right*. The foreign trade in slaves infamous! But the domestic trade in slaves so dear, that *even Congress* must not use its constitutional powers to regulate it.—The *foreign slave trade*, which is out of the grasp of its power, it anathematizes to the world, and would *instantly* abolish; but the *domestic slave trade*, which, with *slavery its parent*, is all its own, and entirely subject to its *will*, thro' its various legislatures, it presses to its bosom, and hurls defiance against every one who assails it. Such is man! Such is the wisdom of expecting to abolish slavery, by *legally* condemning one of its effects. The demand must be destroyed, before the supply will cease—slavery must be abolished, before the *slave trade* can be extinguished. God must be obeyed with a *whole heart, cordially*, before God's blessing can be expected—He is not to be mocked!—and the longer he forbears to smite the hypocrite, the more certain, and the more dreadful must be the blow, with which he shall vindicate His government. "Vengeance is mine. I will repay, saith the Lord!"

its final abolition."!! Humanity to Africa was earnestly urged, *and love to the slaves!!!*

These, and many other similar difficulties, were brought forward between 1789 and 1807, and were fairly met and fully answered in both houses. It is most honorable to Mr. Stanley, (the colonial agent, above mentioned,) that in the course of these debates, he was convinced of his error; frankly acknowledged it, and voted for the abolition.

The motion in 1806, which appeared so *obscure* to Lord Castlereagh, was, "that the House, considering the African slave trade, to be contrary to the principles of justice, humanity and sacred policy, will, with all practicable expedition, take effectual measures for the abolition of the said trade, in such manner, and at such period, as may be deemed advisable."

Several members declared that they would have voted for it with still more pleasure, had it been for *immediate* abolition.

The *ayes* and *noes* were taken in the House of Commons, on the 10th June, 1806, and in the House of Lords, on the 24th. In the former, the *ayes* were 114, and the *noes* 15. In the latter, the "*contents*" were 41, and the *not contents*" 20.

Early in 1807, Lord Grenville introduced in the House of Lords, "a bill for the abolition of the slave trade." Counsel was heard against it for four days, and it was then amply discussed. It passed, and being sent to the Commons, obtained their sanction, on the 10th February. In the House of Lords, it had a majority of 100 to 36—and in the House of Commons, of 283 to 16. The royal assent was obtained, through the particular exertions of Lord Grenville, on 25th March.

So fell the *British legality* of the African slave trade. The prognostics of havoc and ruin, were found to be phantoms. The £70,000,000 (upwards of \$3000,000,000,) claimed as compensation, were mentioned no more—and soon, its most earnest defenders, equalled its most strenuous enemies, in covering it with every term of reproach and disgust. The law which had long given it honor, proclaimed it to be "*felony*." Did the law *then* change its nature? No! It *then* merely affirmed the truth about it. *Before*, it had covered up its depravity. *Now*, it called it, what it always was, *felony*; and felony of the highest grade.

But the *African slave trade* was not abolished—and much less *the slave trade itself*. For several years a contraband commerce in African slaves was notoriously continued; and I know of no good reason to believe, that it ever ceased *entirely*, prior to the abolition of slavery, especially in Demerara and the Mauritius. When *apparently* extinguished in the *West Indies*, fifteen or twenty years ago, its place was supplied by the *inter-colonial slave trade*; the older and less fertile colonies, such as the Bahamas, &c. &c., selling and transporting slaves to the more recently acquired and fertile, such as Trinidad and Demerara—(exactly such a trade in slaves as now exists to an increasing extent, and with unmitigated horrors, in the *slave* United States.) And when the abominations of this atrocious substitution of one form of the iniquity for another, awakened the British heart to put it down (about 1825) the resource, which is immediately inseparable from slavery, of buying and selling between the plantations, remained, and afforded a dying nourishment to the self-destroying and brutal system, of forced and unrequited toil. *The slave trade, consists fundamentally in buying and selling men and women and children, like merchandise, wherever, or by whomsoever they are so bought, and not in the locality where the crime is perpetrated.* It is equally a trade in grain, for two adjoining farmers to buy and sell it between themselves, as if they sent it to China and received tea in return. The difficulties and the distresses of the trade might differ exceedingly—but the *nature of the trade*, would be the same in both—and if the one was criminal in its own nature, the other could not be guiltless. If in the nature of God's Providence, it is contrary to justice and humanity to buy and sell immortal and accountable beings as merchandise, it must be as truly so, whether the trade be between Africa and America—between Virginia and Louisiana—or, between two adjoining estates in Maryland. *The degree* merely, not the *nature* of the crime differs.*

* Shortly before the *legal* abolition in the West Indies, of the *inter-colonial* slave trade, Mr. Pennock, a Wesleyan Missionary, heard that a slave belonging to his church had just had his wife and nine children sold, to be taken away from him to another island; and hastened to the shore to bid the family farewell, and to sympathise with the bereaved husband and father. Mr. Pennock arrived in the midst of the parting embraces. He saw the man fold each of his children in his arms, and heard him advise them to be patient and obedient, and to look to God. At length he turned to his wife—but he was transfixed—he gazed upon her—but he moved not. They advanced to carry her off. He fell as though the lightning had

But the friends of liberty and humanity pleased themselves with the delightful idea, that their work was accomplished—that the slave trade was abolished—that slavery would be immediately and increasingly mitigated in consequence; and that the increasing mitigations, would even, tuate at no distant day, in its entire abolition.

Such was the easy British dream for several years.

In this interval appeared an anonymous pamphlet, (1826) afterwards ascertained to have been written by Elizabeth Heyrick, of Leicester. She advocated "immediate emancipation," with all the force of everlasting Truth, leaving the half-witted wisdom of the age behind her—and was deemed half mad, because she was not so crazy as what the times called wisdom. She shews in her letter, the *inadequacy* of *gradual emancipation*; the loss of fundamental and eternal principle which it involves; and the dreadful effects which it produces; and she proves, the *safety* and *expediency* of *immediate emancipation*. Unfettered by the sophistries of nature and of ages, the sun of Eternal Truth, had risen on her mind, in its glory, while the day was dawning on others, benevolent and noble, but not unshackled like her. But her principles, though deemed *ultra* at the time, worked mightily, and are part of the leaven, with which every soul must be leavened before it can be saved.

But the voice of distant anguish came across the sea and tales were whispered of dreadful doings in the West.

But how *can* such things *be*? said the slave party. Would a man destroy his own property? We assure you that we love our slaves, and are fathers to them. They are the happiest peasantry in the world. They have no care—they are supplied with every thing. Their families are provided for; and as for liberty, they would not accept of it, if you would give it to them. We cannot *now*, you know, get new supplies from Africa, and you yourselves have agreed, that when the foreign supply was cut off, we should be under a

pierced him; the blood gushed from his nostrils and ears—and *there*, while he lay weltering in his gore, his wife and children were carried away from him, on earth, most probably, to meet no more! Mr. Pennock had to fly the scene, that he might not be implicated in "*rebellion*."

Two or three days afterwards the disconsolate man came to his minister for comfort. But what could I do for him, said the missionary—nothing, added he, but to repeat to him the doctrines of resignation and meekness, smothering in myself as well as I could, all the gushings of nature.

Such are the scenes, with endless modifications of mitigation or aggravation, which are yearly occurring by hundreds in the slave portion of the United States.

necessity of treating our slaves well, that they might increase and multiply, and so supply us still with laborers. The theory seemed plausible and its belief was convenient; for it exonerated the friends of humanity from one of the most painful struggles which man can wage with man.

But the groan of anguish and of outrage deepened, and testimonies came, which permitted philanthropy no longer to wrap herself in her soft mantle of easy credulity—her heart was roused for she had heard the cry of her brother's blood. But it was roused more by *humanity*, than by *religion*, it looked to suffering rather than to crime; it wanted to alleviate misery, rather than to put an end to guilt; to *mitigate* the affliction of the slave, rather than to *overturn* the atrocious power of the slave master. On these grounds it felt at liberty to parley with slavery; not called upon of God to aim at its immediate and total extinction. But even in this crippled form philanthropy was mighty; and Mr. Canning, the minister of the day, knowing that beneath its mawkish exterior of gradualism and amelioration, the British heart, ready to be awakened, was beating, took the cause into his own hands; and thus, the people confiding in their government, felt at liberty to take another easy doze.

But Mr. Canning had undertaken a task more knotty than he seems to have expected. He began with confidence—he ended with supplication.

On 15th May, 1824, he carried thro' the House of Commons the following Resolutions—got them soon afterwards passed by the Lords and obtained the royal sanction.

1. "That it is expedient to adopt effectual and decisive measures for meliorating the condition of the slave population in his majesty's colonies."

2. "That thro' a determined and persevering, but judicious and temperate enforcement of such measures, the House looks forward to a progressive improvement in the character of the slave population—such as may prepare them for a participation in the civil rights and privileges, which are enjoyed by other classes of H. M. subjects."

3. "That this House is anxious for the accomplishment of this purpose, at the earliest period which may be compatible with the well-being of the slaves—the safety of the colonies—and with a fair and equitable consideration of all parties concerned therein."

Having thus secured parliamentary ground, he framed a set of ameliorating resolutions, and securing for them the approbation of the leaders of the slave party at home, transmitted them officially to the legislatures of the various Chartered Colonies, with the following warning (after expressions of the greatest confidence in their ready and cordial concurrence) "I must add, any resistance which should partake not of reason, but of contumacy, would create a case, upon which H. M. government, would not hesitate to come down to Parliament for counsel."

But what was the first return from the West? Defiance or evasion!—The slaveholders and agents in the Colonies knew too well the influence over their coadjutors and masters, and the influence of the slave faction at home, over the Supreme Government, to quail before the ministerial menace; and further measures became necessary on the part of the friends of humanity.

Then arose the London Anti-Slavery Society: but it rose with half a heart—the enemy of *suffering* rather than of *sin*—seeking to relieve the lamb, while it left him in the lion's paws: to stop the fountain, by striking at some of its streams: to redress the wrongs of the slave, by mitigating his slavery and not by delivering him from it!

Mr. Canning seems to have writhed under the disappointment and in 1824 lowering his tone, spake thus: "no feeling of wounded pride—no motive of questionable expediency; nothing short of demonstrable necessity, shall induce me to meet the awful question of the transcendental power of Parliament, over every dependency of the British Crown." And then he stoops to flattery, and expresses his "full assurance that much time will not elapse, before we shall learn that the planter of Jamaica is anxiously employed, in emulating the endeavors of the government in Trinidad, to improve the condition of the slaves."

The planter of Jamaica scornfully exulted in his triumph, and the leaders of the slave faction at home, recanting their ministerial concurrence, took the part of their contumacious friends in the colonies.

In 1826, shortly before he died, Mr. Canning was humbler still—he said "In the first instance, we attempted by exhortations, to induce them to act upon the principles of the regulations passed in May, 1832, leaving to themselves

entirely, the mode of action—and I did hope at that time, that that most desirable result would have been attained—but I am ready to admit, that I have been disappointed”—“I cannot pretend to deny, that the last proceedings in the principal colonial legislature” (Jamaica) “have filled me with sentiments, which I do not wish to express”—then, all prostrate beneath colonial terrors, he adds “But I would rather address an imploring voice to the legislature and entreat them quickly to wipe away the stain:—and from some circumstances which have come to my knowledge, I have the greatest hopes, that in the next session of the Colonial Legislature, an act will pass to accomplish this object.”

The triumphant legislature of Jamaica *realized* these hopes and *wiped away the stain!* in December, 1827, by enacting amongst other things:

“The whip is not forbidden in the field, lest the abandonment too suddenly of a long established usage* should be misunderstood by the slaves. * * * * Until negro women have acquired more of the sense of shame, which distinguishes European females, it will be impossible with respect to them, to lay aside altogether punishment by flogging, their being no substitute that promises to be accompanied with the same salutary dread.”

Then with all the airs of Eastern despots—no—I ought to say of Western slave masters! they conclude “The House has now calmly reviewed the reasons which are given for disallowing the slave act of last session. They cannot pass a new bill, containing the amendment suggested in Mr. Huskisson’s despatch, without sacrificing their independence and endangering the safety of the island; and as the local government is forbidden to sanction such a bill as the House can consent to pass, the slave population must again be governed by the act of 1816. When it shall please His Majesty, to withdraw the instructions to the governor, which limit the legislative power of the Assembly, the House

* The long established usage, thus *doatingly cherished* by the Legislature of Jamaica, was, whenever a female slave, did not please her master or manager, if he thought fit, immediately to have her thrown prostrate on the ground, her face downwards—then to uncover her back with the most brutal indecency, and flog her at discretion—often till gashed and weltering in her blood; frequently compelling her own children to help to hold her down by her stretched out limbs, and sometimes her husband or son to flog her. And this was the Jamaica way of instructing negro women in the sense of shame which distinguishes European females. Such is the *wisdom* of using slavery as a preparative for freedom!!

which limit the legislative power of the Assembly, the House will once more take the slave code, into their serious consideration."!!

The drama of Colonial arrogance and of ministerial prostration, was at its height, when, as reported in *The (London) Times* of 22d July, 1828, the Duke of Wellington declared "We (the ministers of the Crown) have not the power to force the Colonists, to adopt the measures of amelioration proposed to them."

Behold the spectacle; Great Britain and her pampered colonies!—The urchin growls and the parent is prostrate! What resource remains? Must slavery forever gnaw the heart of freedom? Must Britain continue hopelessly to carry a lie in her right hand, whenever she boasts of liberty; dreaming proudly of magnanimity, while she is plundering and outraging without remorse, *her own guiltless poor!* The nation has been tried; and at the nation's call, the government arose. The government has essayed its strength and been foiled. Buonaparte's conqueror exclaims, "we cannot enforce even measures of *amelioration!*" What resource remained?

Why God remained! and His truth remained! and his seven thousand men that had not bowed the knee to Baal, remained! and righteous law remained the same glorious thing forever, however sophistries may entangle, or influence prevent, or wickedness abuse it for a time. The soul of impartial equity and holy love remained, not dead, though slumbering. The clarion call of the fearful emergency awakened it; and it slowly arose, and girded itself for the battle.

The British spirit was again in action, and the slave spirit undauntedly met it. On the side of truth, the power of *voluntary association*, with *no arms*, but the weapons which through God are mighty; the peaceful arms of truth and love!—with no funds, but such as willing and grateful affection poured into the treasury of the Lord's work. On the side of slavery the most powerful faction, which has ever endangered and disgraced the British empire—mighty in resources of power, influence and wealth, scoffing like a giant in its strength, at its pigmy adversary.

But that despised and slandered pigmy, had more than a giant's strength—when most weak, it was most strong, "taking pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake."—2 Cor. xii. 10.

It was, however, as yet in the twilight; its eyes were heavy and its vision dim. It aimed only at the amelioration of the condition of the slaves, and at the gradual and eventual abolition of slavery. Its Parliamentary leader retained much the same sentiments as he is reported to have declared in 1823. "The object at which we aim, is the extinction of slavery—nothing less than the extinction of slavery—in nothing less than the whole of the British dominions; not, however, the rapid termination of that state—not the sudden emancipation of the negro—but such preparatory steps, such measures and precautions as by slow degrees, and in a course of years, first fitting and qualifying the slave for the enjoyment of freedom, shall gently conduct us to the annihilation of slavery. Nothing can more clearly shew, that we mean nothing rash, nothing rapid, nothing abrupt, nothing bearing any feature of violence, than this, that if I succeed to the fullest extent of my desires confessedly sanguine, no man will be able to say—I, even, shall not be able to predict, that at such a time, or in such a year, slavery will be abolished. We are far from meaning to attempt to cut down slavery in the full maturity of its vigor. We rather should leave it gently to decay—slowly—silently—almost imperceptibly, to die away and to be forgotten."

The slave faction perceived the advantage thus given, and boldly availed themselves of it. The contest remained as it had been, *one of expediency*—not the assertion of righteousness, but the mitigation of sin—not the abolition of slavery, but the improvement of the condition of the slave, yet remaining in bondage. The ground was the adversary's, and the friends of humanity fought to great disadvantage on it. They seem not to have perceived, that if any transgression of God's holy law can be justified for a moment, it has as good a right to be sanctioned for ever—that when once in a course of sin, "preparing to do right is continuing to do wrong." They seem not to have perceived that they were rejecting God from their counsels—and were proceeding exactly on the principles of their antagonists, only in a more humane and decent form. They did not wish the laborer, *at once*, independently to enjoy his wages, under just and benignant laws; but only to be driven less brutally and indecently to forced and overwhelming toil! They did not wish female purity to be at once secured, as far as law

can secure it, from violation ; but only to be removed somewhat further from danger ! They did not wish domestic authority to be restored in its holiest amplitude to parents ; but only that it might be less completely extinguished !—They did not wish that the wife should be her husband's—and the husband his wife's—but only that they should be somewhat more protected from their petty tyrant's arbitrary interference ! They did not wish that the whole light of heaven should be left as free as God has made and willed it, to pour without obstruction, upon the minds of the outraged and guiltless poor ; but only that the power and opportunity of obstructing it, should be curtailed. I do not mean, that they did not wish for these and such like things in their hearts—but I mean that they did not wish for them sufficiently to aim at them in their association ; and who that believes, that the concurrence and blessing of God is indispensable to direct success in every holy enterprise, can wonder that their progress was impeded and slow !

Yet they made progress—for they were in earnest. Love, after all, was their spirit, and God was their trust, and they could say, with him of old, “ Lord, we believe—help Thou our unbelief.” In *this*, they differed totally from their adversaries. They yielded their own holy ground, not because they sympathized with slave masters ; but because they overrated their power ; they had not cast off the fear of God, but they had yielded unduly to the fear of man ; they loved not a fraction of tyranny, but they did not look to God sufficiently, to take it by the horns ; they panted for thorough righteousness ; but they believed it unwise to pursue it at once.—Their adversaries, on the contrary, were only bent (I mean *as a body*) upon perpetuating the revelry of the rich, and the learned, and the strong, upon the plunder and the degradation of the helpless poor.

At this time, “ anti-slavery” and “ negro friend” associations had been extensively organized through England ; and in Dublin an efficient one flourished, with several correspondencies in Ireland.

A new stumbling block was presented.

It was *the theory* of confining every effort in favor of the slaves, to *care for their souls*. It was put forth by some of the best men and women in the higher walks of life ; and carried away many from the greater and holier battle.—

"What," said it, "is temporal to spiritual bondage?" What the slavery of the body, to the slavery of the mind? Free them from their masters, and yet leave them slaves to sin, and what will you have done for them? Many of their masters are christians!! through *these*, we can have access to multitudes—here is a field ample enough for all our resources—in entering it, we shall offend no one; we shall come into collision with nobody—all will be peace and kindness. Thus may we gradually prevail through the concurrence of the better order of masters, in exhibiting to the next, the advantages of education and of kindness—and through them to the next, until the whole mass shall be christianized and prepared, and *then* of course, there will be no difficulty in delivering them all from bondage."!! This theory had all the plausibility of which it is susceptible, in *Great Britain*; because both the colonial and national laws, favored the religious instruction of the slaves; and missionaries—not *missionary slaveholders*, or *companions of slaveholders*—but missionaries of the cross, the parents in Christ, and friends and servants of the poor, had large access to them.

But the theory was too obviously false, both in nature and in fact, to deceive extensively, a people not courting deception. It was readily and clearly seen, that the *words of a law*, in favor of religious instruction, could avail but little, while *that same law*, *invested the master with almost unlimited powers*: and that even where masters were really desirous of evangelizing their slaves, the continuance of the slave system, presented in general, almost insuperable difficulties. It became as evident as noonday, that the *barrier of slavery must be removed*, before the Gospel could find access to the great body of the slaves; and that it was theorizing away truth, and evading the *cross* of duty, to leave the million in deepest spiritual and social death, insulted, polluted, trampled upon and perishing, without succor or pity; while the rich stream of love to liberty and to man, was confined to the few who could be approached without exciting the tyrant's terrors. In the course of this discussion, also, the question of *christian slaveholders* was well explored, and it was very universally seen amongst the real enemies of slavery, that a *christian slaveholder*, is a contradiction in terms: that a Christ-like man, can no more "op-

press the poor, because he is poor,"—can no more plunder the helpless and the down-trodden of their time, their wages, their choice, their honor and their rights, (uncondemned and guiltless; free, in a moral sense, immortal and accountable as they are;) than he could break through the *minor* barrier of human laws, and by plundering the rich and *the free*, of property unspeakably less precious, subject himself amongst men, to a felon's judgment, or a felon's death.

(To be continued.)

SLAVERY TESTED BY ITS OWN CODE.

BY WILLIAM GOODELL.

It is of the utmost importance that all our inquiries and reasonings in respect to slavery and emancipation, should be conducted in view of the distinctive features of the American slave system. We should accurately know, and constantly remember, what *American* slavery is, in careful distinction from all other forms of servitude, whether ancient or modern. The evil must first be understood, before we can wisely prescribe the remedy. And when objections are made, or difficulties suggested, in respect to any propositions or measures advanced by the friends of emancipation, the objector should remember, in the first place, that the emancipation of the slave means nothing more nor less than his exemption from the *precise things* wherein American slavery essentially consists. In the second place, he should understand exactly what these things are; and see well to it that his objections or difficulties have a definite meaning and rational application, when placed by the side of *the facts* wherein slavery and emancipation consist. We might almost hazard the assertion, that a simple compliance with this reasonable rule, would very soon lead to the adjustment, among conscientious men and sincere Christians, of every important question that can be raised in respect to American slavery and its remedy. To this single point, therefore, the attention of the entire community can scarcely be too often directed, or too steadily riveted. In the wide range of debate, it is easy to multiply words, to start various and discordant opinions, and *lose sight* of the precise point most

necessary to be kept clearly in view. Abolitionists as well as their opponents, should be often reminded of this, or they will fail to see and exhibit clearly, the true merits of the question. We may consider it no vain repetition, then, to say over again and again, what has already been said on this point, particularly at the present moment, when our publications are to be thrown before thousands who have seldom or never perused anti-slavery discussions.

American slavery can only be defined by its own Statute Book. Slaveholders cannot complain that the system should be taken to be the very thing which the laws of the slaveholding states have declared it to be:—laws framed by themselves for the very purpose of defining and protecting their claims. It is a well known historical maxim, that “no people were ever found to be better than their laws, though many have been known to be worse.”* And again, “no laws were ever framed by any people for the purpose of restraining specific and enumerated crimes, unless the instances of such crimes had become aggravated and general among them.”†—The laws of the slave states, therefore, which *fix* the condition of slavery, for the most part *describe* that condition. And even the laws made to *restrain* its cruelties bear testimony to their *existence*. For an illustration, under the item last mentioned;—When the laws of South Carolina gravely forbid the masters, under a petty pecuniary penalty, to “cut out the tongues, put out the eyes, or cruelly scald, burn, or deprive any slave of any limb or member,” and when they specify other enormities too gross for the public eye, they proclaim to the world the fact that such cruel practices did prevail, to an extent demanding legislation. And, again, under the former item;—When the same statute permits the master to inflict punishment on the slave “by whipping or beating with a horse whip, cow-skin, switch, or small stick—putting on irons, or confining or imprisoning” &c.—the legislature, at once, defines and describes the common condition of slavery in that state.—And characteristics of the system, thus obtained, are to be reckoned, *not* among its incidents and abuses, but among

* *Priestly*.—As this profound explorer of antiquity, and minute observer of human customs and institutions, resided for a long time in America, we may be certain that he did not consider Americans exempt from this rule, or he would have specified the exception.

† *Id.* in substance—quoted from memory.

its essential and distinctive features, the things wherein it essentially consists. With these remarks in view, and with the Statute Books before us, let us enquire—*What is American slavery?*—We answer it is—

1. *The assumed right of man to hold property in man—to transform moral BEINGS to mere THINGS—chattels personal—human brutes.*—

“‘Goods they are, and goods they are esteemed,’ says the civil law.” [Dr. Taylor’s Elements, p. 429.—Stroud, p. 21.]

“A slave is one who is in the power of his master to whom he belongs.”—[Code of La. Art. 35, Stroud, p. 22.]

“The *cardinal principle* of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings but among things, as an article of property, a chattel personal, obtains as undoubted law in all the American Slave States.” [Stroud, p. 22.]

“Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken and reputed to be chattels personal, in the hands of their owners and possessors, their administrators and assigns, TO ALL INTENTS, CONSTRUCTIONS AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER!” [Law of South Carolina, vide Stroud.]

An act of Maryland, in 1798, respecting the settlement of estates, and the division of property, expressly enumerates “specific articles, such as *slaves*, working beasts, animals, furniture, books,” and other personal effects.

The careful reader will understand that this feature of slavery, (like those we shall proceed to mention,) is no mere incident, appendage, or abuse of the system. It constitutes its very essence and ground work. Every person held as an American slave is held under this *precise tenure*, and no species nor degree of kind treatment can do away the *fact*, or wipe out the sin contained in it. Every American slaveholder is such, in virtue of this law. He cannot hold a slave without holding to its validity, and giving it the sanction of his example. And this feature of American slavery necessarily and invariably includes—

2. *The denial of God’s moral government over the slave—the usurpation of his authority—the annihilation of the rights of conscience.*

So long as one human being is held the absolute property of another, and entirely subject to his control, in respect to all actions and conduct, so long is he subjected to the most absolute spiritual despotism that can be conceived. He cannot

follow his own conscience, nor the law of God. The will of his master is his only law. And the law of slavery so understands it.

"This dominion" says Stroud, "is as *unlimited* as that which is tolerated, by any civilized community, in respect to brute animals, to 'quadrupeds,' according to the very language of the civil law."

Every American slave is held in this condition; and every American slaveholder holds his slave in this condition, and under the authority of this code, which he necessarily sanctions. No human being can have any moral right to do this.—Will it be said that some masters grant their slaves religious privileges?—that they extend to them Christian instruction?—that they never require them to break the Divine law? If this should be granted, for the argument's sake, to the fullest possible extent, it would not do away the *fact* we have stated. To grant religious *privileges*, to a smaller or greater extent, is not to recognize *religious rights*. This cannot be done by the slaveholder till he abandons slaveholding, and abjures the code which confers on him the pretended prerogative of granting or withholding religious privileges, as he pleases. No man exercises religious *rights*, who enjoys religious *privileges* as the mere gift of another who may take them away at his pleasure. And besides this; *no* American slaveholder ever granted to *any* slave, *ALL* the religious privileges he enjoys himself. No American slave can have the privilege to go where *he* judges his duty to God and his species calls him: to reside where his own spiritual edification could be, in his view, best promoted, and his children most religiously instructed—to join what communion he pleases—to attend what meetings and with whom he chooses—to preach or print the whole counsel of God, on any subject of truth and duty. These are some of the religious rights enjoyed by every American slaveholder, but never conferred by him, even as privileges, on any one of his slaves. He cannot do it while he remains a slaveholder. Nor can he, in most of the slave states, instruct his slave to read the Sacred Scriptures, without transgressing the fundamental laws of slavery—because—

3. *American slavery, of necessity, includes a direct infringement of religious rights and privileges, by specific*

acts of legislation for the express purpose.—This might be easily inferred from the foregoing. No people can long be kept “entirely subject to the wills of their masters to whom they belong”* if permitted to understand and obey the will of one Supreme Master in Heaven. Accordingly we find early and severe enactments prohibiting the instruction of slaves, and punishing them for assembling “for divine worship” and for “mental instruction,” [Vide Stroud, p. 88—90.] And the reason given for their enactments has always indicated the incompatibility of such privileges and acquirements, with the condition of slavery.—“The allowing of slaves to read”—says the law of S. Carolina, A. D. 1740,—“would be attended with many inconveniences”! That is, it is inconsistent with slavery!—“Mental improvement” and “divine worship” are the very things specified in several of these prohibitory enactments. Apologists for slavery, even at the North, have recently contended that slaves cannot be safely permitted to be taught to read, and religious editors, though contending that slaves must *first* be prepared for emancipation before it can wisely be granted, have, at the same time doubted whether slaves, remaining such, should be taught to read the Bible! And a system of mere *oral* religious instruction for the slaves, without giving them the Bible, has lately been devised at the South, and commended and approved by Christian ministers at the North, while the same persons are arraigning the Romish church as anti-christian, for pursuing the same policy in respect to the whites! By the American slave laws, white freemen themselves are subjected to fines and imprisonment for teaching the colored people to read. And “if any person in Louisiana, from the box, bench, stage, *pulpit*, or in any other place, or in conversation, shall make use of any language, signs, or actions, having a *tendency* to produce discontent among free colored people, or insubordination among the slaves” [i. e. such as may give them a hope in the promise of God that they shall be free] “such person shall be punished with imprisonment, from three to twenty-three years, or with DEATH, at the discretion of the court.”

Such are the words of the law, and similar enactments

* The reader is referred to Stroud's sketch of the slave laws, Rankin's Letters, and Jay's Inquiry, for ample information in respect to the laws of slavery. We have not room here, even for a condensed selection of extracts.

exist in the other slave states. It is in vain to plead that these laws are not an integral part of the American slave system, and that they might be repealed without abolishing American slavery. Their own preambles and phraseology, together with the excuses of their northern apologists, sufficiently confute the supposition, and warrant us in saying that they are not incidental appendages, but a part of the system itself. To be a slaveholder is to support the system that infringes religious freedom.—The same truth appears further in the item which next follows.

4. *American Slavery enjoins disobedience to God's law—prohibits and discourages moral purity and chastity—and legalizes and compels concubinage and vice.*

“Slaves are not entitled to the considerations of matrimony, and therefore have no relief in cases of adultery.” [Dr. Taylor’s Elements, p. 429—Stroud, 21.] Nor is this feature of the code an excrescence that can be spared from the system. It *must* be so, if “the slave is entirely subject to his master to whom he belongs.” It must be so, if “slaves be deemed, sold, taken, and reputed to be chattels personal in the hands of their possessors, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever”—Will the Christian slaveholder plead ‘not guilty’ to the charge under this item, because he never personally separated a husband and wife—or never required a woman when separated from her husband, to live with another man—or never held in Christian fellowship without rebuke his neighboring Christian brethren and sisters, both slaves and masters, who submitted to customs, or commanded compliances like these?—Will his singular innocence in these respects screen him? Has he ever borne consistent testimony against these abominations which surround him? No. He has not. And while he remains a slaveholder he cannot.—Why! he holds slaves solely under the tenure of that code which renders all this promiscuous concubinage inevitably certain! Nay, he holds them in a condition in which he himself cannot shield them from its pollutions. He may become a bankrupt to-day, or die insolvent to-morrow, next week, or next year. In either case, his servants are sold to the highest bidder, in lots to suit purchasers, and to go wherever interest, caprice, cupidity or lust may dictate! What right has he to hold his fellow-beings, perhaps his fellow-christians, under a code like

this? Will he mock their sensibilities, belie the truth, and shame his holy professions, by talking of the kind "treatment" he bestows on moral and accountable beings held by him under a system of adulterous outrage like this? A system which breaks up the family state ordained by God, blots out the seventh commandment, and renders void the law to "honor thy father and mother"?—A system which transforms the teeming progeny of its victims into the mere "goods and chattels" of their own sires who breed them shamelessly for sale, and tear them ruthlessly from their mothers, for a distant market? Every American slaveholder knows, or may know, that his slaveholding upholds this system of legalized crime and guilt. How then, can he plead "not guilty" to the charge against slavery under this item?

5. *American slavery is theft—robbery—plunder—piracy—man-stealing.*—It is so in its origin, and its tenure. It is so by the laws of God, and by the laws of man. It can be proved such by the laws of nations, acknowledged and promulgated by our own national government. Have we not declared the African slave-trade to be piracy? But that same trade is the foundation of the American slave system. If the African slave-trade be piracy, then the claim of each and every slaveholder to each and every slave, is a claim founded on nothing but piracy. If the African slave-trade be piracy, then the Domestic slave-trade, both inland and coast-wise, is piracy also. And the buyers and sellers, the traffickers and those supplied by the traffic, are alike pirates. This statement agrees with the law of God. "He that steal-eth a man and selleth him, *or if he be found in his hand*, he shall surely be put to death." Such was the law of Moses, and the spirit of the prohibition remains. We are not bound to inflict the same penalty; though it is now done in the case of the African slaver. The act is *morally* the same. In the New Testament as well as in the Old, man-stealing is expressly prohibited, and men-stealers are ranked among the most abandoned transgressors. Now God does not forbid imaginary sins which can never be committed, nor warn us against the commission of sins to which we are not exposed. Neither does he ever describe classes of sinners who do not exist. But if the African slaver be not a man-stealer, it is impossible to define or describe the crime, or prove that the criminal ever existed. The laws punishing

that traffic as piracy, declare that the crime and the criminal do still exist ; and if this be true, then slavery in this country, constitutes the crime of man-stealing. The present tenure of slave property can be no better than it has been from the beginning.

And slaveholding is robbery and theft, because it withholds the hire of the laborer. Those who "oppress the hireling in his wages," are called robbers by God himself. And this accords to the dictates of common sense. The nature and essence of theft or robbery, in any case, consists in the taking from another, without an equivalent and without his consent, the avails of his honest labor. There is nothing sacred in the idea of property itself, nothing that gives its inviolability a moral sanction, aside from the principle which secures to every man a recompense for his own labor. To deny that compulsory labor for individual benefit, enforced on innocent persons, without wages, is theft, robbery, or plunder, is the same as to deny that any such crimes can exist. It is to unsettle the foundations of all the rights of property in all cases whatever !

"Go to, now, ye rich men, weep and howl * * * Behold the hire of your laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth ; and the cries of them which have reaped, have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." Will you say, you have bought the laborers themselves, or inherited them from your fathers ?—*Bought what ?* The image of your Maker ? The children of your Father ? The purchase of your Redeemer ? The temples of your Sanctifier ? Bought them ! Of whom ? Inherited them ! From whom ? From their kidnappers ? from pirates ? from slavers ? the men-stealers ? Is *this* then, your title ? A claim to a part in their iniquity ? Will you plead that their food and clothing are their wages ? What ? "A quart of corn a day," as saith the law of S. Carolina ? A "barrel of corn and a peck of salt a month," as in Louisiana ? "One linen shirt and pantaloons in summer, and a linen shirt and great coat and pantaloons in winter" ? All this for "*only* fifteen hours in a day, labor, in summer, and fourteen in winter" ? These are the enactments to prevent a scantier fare and a severer labor, which slave masters have imposed. But is the christian slave master who chances to read this, a rare exception ? Be it so, his example of slaveholding sus-

tains the entire system. But to how much does the exception amount? How much does the pattern of Christian slaveholders account, "rendering unto servants the things just and equal"? Are *they* satisfied with his equal justice? *Wages* implies a stipulated and mutually agreed price.—Wages, to be "just and equal," must be sufficient to the support of the laborer, not as a mere animal, but as an intellectual and moral being. Something which he can earn without consuming all his time, so as to leave no adequate space for rational improvement and social enjoyment. Something which shall stimulate industry with the hope of acquiring, and confer the pecuniary means of doing good. Something which shall honor his moral nature, by making him the responsible steward of heaven's bounties. No American slaveholder pays the slave this. Wages are never paid to one's own "goods and chattels, which *belong* to him!" No! The claim of *property* in the laborers, belies the profession of paying them wages. The thing exists not, and cannot exist. He only gives them food as working beasts. Every American slaveholder, be he Christian or be he infidel, "withholds the hire of the laborer," and commits robbery and theft, as really as David committed murder and adultery; and should be as faithfully and unsparingly reprov'd. He "treats his servants *kindly*," forsooth; and yet robs them of their daily wages! How would *he* relish the same "kind treatment"? He gives them Christian instruction, and lives by committing daily thefts upon them! Shame on *such* Christian instructors! "But my slaves don't earn as much as it costs me to support them"! Don't they? Then restore to them their freedom. Pay them just wages. "Render unto your servants things just and equal." For those who employ free labor, on honest principles, find no difficulty in procuring as much labor as their disbursements justly entitle them to receive! "Godliness is" indeed, "profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." Honesty is always the best policy. And the unprofitable nature of slave labor furnishes no excuse for the slave master. It neither proves him wise nor honest, but the contrary.

6. *American slavery provides no real protection of the lives and persons of the slaves.*—The show of protection is a mere show, without any substantial reality. This like-

wise is a necessary result of its primary and fundamental principle—the principle of holding absolute property in human beings. If they are “goods and chattels*—to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever,” if they are “entirely subject to the will of their masters, *to whom they belong*,” if the dominion over them is as unlimited as that which is tolerated by any civilized community in respect to brute animals—to “*quadrupeds*,” according to the very language of the civil law, then it is idle to talk of any legislation which shall restrain the absolute proprietor of these goods and chattels and human animals from doing to them and with them, whatever he pleases as much as he does to his working cattle. Admitting the honest intention of the legislature to protect the life of the slaves—(a very extraordinary admission, considering that the legislators are composed of such proprietors, and remembering their legislative sanction to a proprietorship which bears upon the very face of it, the authority of life and death,) admitting, we say, the existence of such an intention, it is difficult to see how the object of protection could be sufficiently effected. The unlimited power of the master comes up every where, as facilitating the commission of outrage, and preventing the means of detection. The master can command any male or female slave to accompany him singly to any spot of lonely secesy, for any purposes of brutality or malice; and there is no room for demur. And after an outrage may have been committed, the guilty master may confine or sell to a distant region, the victim or the incidental witness of his crime. To guard against circumstances like these, a wise and honest legislature would seek for more than usual means of detecting the crime, and additional terrors in punishing the criminal.—Let us then see what peculiarities we can find in the American laws, in respect to the outrages of masters on slaves. In the first place, we notice that no slave or free colored person is allowed to give evidence in any case where a white person is concerned. In the second place,

* There seems to be but one particular in the slave code of the American states inconsistent with this primary principle which transforms human beings into brutes. It is that feature which *punishes* slaves as though they were *intelligent moral agents*; and with a severity *inversely* proportioned to their acquaintance with the laws which they are not permitted to read; and punishes them for actions not criminal in other human beings. How lamentable that the only instance in which the slave polity diverges from self-consistency, should be for the purpose of adding to its infra-human malignity of character!

the punishment, even in cases of murder, is generally a mere pecuniary fine, or temporary imprisonment. In the third place, we find laws assuming the possibility that the slave may "come to his *death* by *moderate correction*!" In the fourth place, we find, as already stated, enactments which authorize "whipping or beating with a horse whip, cowskin, switch, or small stick, putting irons on, and imprisoning." We find also, a vagueness in the laws, in their prohibiting "*unusual*" punishments, though a "*moderate correction*," may cause death! In the fifth place, we find laws which forbid any slave or any free person of color, male or female, under any pretext, to lift a finger against any white person, on pain of death, even in defence of life itself, or for the prevention of outrages worse than murder. Finally, we see the interference even of white persons held in awe by enactments, as before quoted, punishing with imprisonment and even death at the discretion of the court, for a second offence, any free white citizen who "from the box, bench, stage, pulpit, or in *any other place, or in conversation*, shall make use of any language, signs, or *actions* having a *tendency* to produce discontent among free colored people, or insubordination among the slaves." Who does not see that enactments like these must render it both hazardous and odious for a white man to interfere or make himself active in bringing to trial or justice the slave masters suspected or known to have committed outrages on their slaves? Who does not know that such outrages are common, and that interference and punishment are rare? And where, now, we ask, is the "kind treatment" and the Christian deportment that can justify any man in holding human beings under *this* tenure? The good man commits no murder. Does he commit no outrage? Does he never use the lash or allow it to be used? "Oh! but that is *necessary*, sometimes," he says! Yes, and therefore the system is sin; and even *your* slaveholding is sin. For free and honestly rewarded laborers do not need stripes. But you commit no murder! What if it be so. You hold human beings in a condition in which any other white man who pleases, your overseer or your neighbor, may mutilate or murder them with impunity and without danger, except perhaps the danger that you will sue him at the law, for the loss of your property, or the labor of your working animals.

Have you any right to hold human beings in such a condition, and subjected to such laws? No: You have not. You may plead that if you do not commit this great wickedness, somebody else will: in other words, that if you should repent and be forgiven, your neighbors might possibly sin on, and be punished. Be it so. It stands you in hand to escape God's judgments yourself, and to take care that your example does not lure your neighbor to ruin. "Be not partakers in other men's sins"!

Such are the chief outlines of American slavery. It is a definition furnished by its own code. We infer from it—

1. The folly of reasoning on *American* slavery from ancient patriarchal Jewish servitude, which comprised neither of its essential features. Did Abraham hold servants by a tenure which transformed men to mere things? immortal souls to "goods and chattels?" Which blotted out the moral government of God, annulled his laws? forbid his "worship"? proscribed "mental instruction"? put asunder whom God had joined together, repealed the 5th and 7th commandments of the decalogue? compelled promiscuous concubinage? forbade the reading of God's Book? withheld the laborer's hire? provided for the pursuit and re-capture of fugitives? and left the life of the servant without the common protection extended to other persons? or are features like these to be found in the enactments of Moses? No. The adoption in this country, of the laws of Moses, respecting servants, would be equivalent to the *immediate abolition* of the entire American Slave system! The measure would sweep away at once, every fundamental fact in the existence of which the American slave system consists.

2. We infer the irrelevancy and futility of every objection that can be urged in defence or palliation of slavery; or against the doctrine and duty of immediate emancipation, or against the efforts and measures of abolitionists.

It is said that mere slaveholding is not, in itself, *sin*: that it may be either sinful or innocent according to the temper and conduct of the master, in his treatment of his slaves, and his motive for holding them. But there is no such thing as the innocent holding of human beings under the tenure of the American slave code. That code is itself, a complicated system of legalized *sin*:—mischief framed by a law! Every slaveholder under that code, partakes and

sanctions the sin.—What ‘treatment’ can atone for such complacency in sin? And what can be meant by ‘kind treatment’ which holds human beings in such a condition? Is it ‘kind treatment’ because as mere *animals*, they are not ill-fed nor over-worked? Is it kind treatment to be held “entirely subject to the will of the master?” To be “held and taken to be goods and chattels, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever.”—‘Kind treatment’ to be denied the right of living and acting under God’s government? ‘Kind treatment’ to be transferred to the absolute government of a human master who may sell you into the unlimited power of any other master whether wise or foolish, whether Christian or infidel, whether drunken or sober? ‘Kind treatment’ to hold all your religious privileges at the mercy or caprice of this individual! How would you like the ‘kind treatment,’ for yourself and children, of being held under such a code? A code which permits your neighbor to sell your wife and children from you when he pleases? ‘Kind treatment’ that robs you daily of your daily earnings? ‘Kind treatment’ that forbids your emerging into a condition in which your life and limbs, and the chastity of your wife and daughter can be protected, by the same laws which protect your neighbors? Yet this is the ‘kind treatment’ which every American slaveholder, of necessity, extends to his every slave, so long as he withholds *emancipation*, however kind he may be, in other respects.

And what can be said in favor of the *motive* of any Christian master, in holding a human being, under this ‘kind treatment’ and under this code? What motive *can* there be, for such a course, that is not, at the bottom, a selfish and sordid one? From what quarter, or in view of what considerations can a holy motive be drawn for holding a human being under such a code? Is it the good of the *individual*? Incredible! What! For the good of a *moral being* to be held as a mere *thing*? To be transferred from his accountability to God, to the capricious control of an irresponsible human master? For his good, to live under a code which denies his religious rights, which authorizes his neighbor to require him to commit sin—which holds his domestic relations at the mercy of another—which enforces his toil without an equivalent—and leaves his life without protection! All this, for the sole benefit of the

slave! Merciful and most conscientious oppressor! Let us be favored with thy plea.—It is this.—“If the slave should be freed by me, the cruel laws (against which I have never remonstrated nor voted) would instantly apprehend and sell him again into slavery, to a less kind and christian-like master.” In other words, “If I should leave off sinning, somebody else would sin the more greedily: and so I must continue to oppress my neighbor a little, lest some one else should oppress him still more.” We must search further for the *pure motive* of holding any human being in the condition of an American slave! Can that motive be supplied by the beneficent and reforming influences of such an example, on the mass of mankind? Can it be found in the honor it confers on the Christian profession—on the support it gives to the sanctions of pure religion—on the revenue of glory it secures to our one Father and Master in heaven! Alas! No! The pretense is all false and hollow: putrid and rotten to the core. It abides not the scrutiny of impartial men. How then can it stand before the bar of the all seeing God?

A REVIEW.—THE PRINCIPLES OF REFORM.

BY REV. BERAH GREEN, PRESIDENT OF ONEIDA INSTITUTE.

ART. X. On Political and Ecclesiastical Reform. Lit. and Theol. Review, No. VI.

THE divisions which prevail among professed Christians on questions, touching the very vitals of our civil and religious institutions, seem sadly to perplex and sorely to try those confiding brethren, who have been accustomed without hesitation or fear, to tread in the foot-prints of “great and good men.” The authority, on which they used to rely, they begin to regard as a feeble, perhaps a broken staff. The movements of their “great and good men,” embarrass and distract them. The objects, plans and methods, which in some cases enlist the feelings and call forth the exertions of one, another regards with abhorrence. Such divisions present a problem peculiarly dark and difficult to those who have rather consented to be swayed by names, than chosen to be controlled by principles.

We know of one way only, in which minds thus embarrassed, can hope to find effectual relief. A careful survey,

and thorough examination of the *principles* of their accredited teachers and guides, may enable them to form a just estimation of the right and worth of their authority. The tendency and character of an action or habit, in itself doubtful, may, when contemplated in the light of the principle from which it proceeded, appear clear and certain. The conduct of any man, great or small, when thus examined becomes intelligible. On any question of great practical importance, where professed philanthropists are divided, we have to acknowledge a public benefit in any fair exposition of his principles, which a man of high authority and commanding influence may see fit to make. And if we are sure, that he presents the views and opinions of a large and respectable portion of the community, to which we belong, we cannot but feel that he has laid us under increased obligations. We cannot but thank him for the light which he has kindly shed upon the character and movements of those professed friends of humanity, who, while they claimed our sympathy and cooperation in their designs, left us in doubt of the justness and strength of their claims. We are indebted to him for the removal of our doubts. We now see, with *whom*, we are invited to act; and *what* they are intent upon doing.

Under just such obligations as have now been described, has the editor of the Literary and Theological Review laid us in a paper "on Political and Ecclesiastical Reform." We will not be so ungrateful, as to withhold the thanks to which he is manifestly entitled. The train of thought, to which, as a part of his readers, he invites our attention, is certainly deeply interesting and highly instructive. If we are not greatly gratified, we certainly must be much obliged, with the annunciation of maxims, principles, doctrines;—with the description of objects, designs, methods;—with the development of spirit, which Mr. Woods makes in the article just alluded to; and in which, we suppose, he coincides with a large majority of those who assist in supporting his journal. The article of Mr. Woods, whose title we have given, deserves, we think, an attentive perusal, and a thorough examination. On some of the things which it contains, we shall suggest a few thoughts to assist our readers, so far as we are able, to form a just estimation of the aims, plans, spirit and exertions, which on high authority, are commended to our consideration, confidence and adoption.

When Mr. Woods affirms, that "the fundamental institutions of government and religion" "were intended for the public good alone;" that this object demands, that they should be carefully adapted to the rising wants and advancing stages of human society; that unless they are to be continually *revolutionized*, they must be continually *reformed*; when he finds ground for this necessity in the unfitness of arrangements, suited to the infancy of the world, for its maturity, and in a proclivity in both civil and religious institutions, through the depravity of those by whom and for whom, they are administered, to run into various abuses, by which, they become scourges instead of blessings; when he places the aim and standard of the work of reform in that blissful state, in which nothing shall hurt or molest; and to this work, wisely conducted, assigns the highest place among all the departments of human beneficence; when he asserts, that in a state of imperfection like ours, the business of doing good seems of necessity, for the most part, to take the shape of reform; and when he throws out the hint, distinctly and pointedly, that it is the intermission of the work of reform, which produces, by and by, the necessity of revolution, he says nothing, to which we cannot give our hearty and full assent. An exposition, so clear and forcible, of the principles and doctrines, which must lie at the very basis of any well-directed effort to improve the character, condition and prospects of mankind, we cannot but regard, as well timed and of great worth. In the paragraphs, from which the above quotations were taken, Mr. Woods addresses us in a style and spirit, worthy of the place he holds, and of the responsibilities he has assumed. The position which he here took, is so attractive and commanding, that we cannot help pausing awhile, to observe it.

1. How high the "aim," to which he lifts the reformer's eye, and how exact the "standard," to which he teaches him to adjust his designs and exertions! The introduction of that "blissful state, in which nothing shall hurt or molest," is the sublime object, with which he is to be continually engrossed. In whatever he may do or attempt for the benefit of those, to whom he may be related, his pathway must lie along on the line of perfect rectitude. He is not to be driven aside from his aim, or diverted from his chosen track by the senseless sneers or malignant taunts of any who may see fit

to hold him up to public scorn, as a "visionary enthusiast," or a citizen of "Utopia." He knows, well enough, that unless his STANDARD BE CORRECT, his exertions will not even TEND to the accomplishment of good. In his objects, plans and efforts, therefore, he keeps his eye kindled and his heart a glowing with the transforming and enrapturing vision of that "blissful state, in which nothing shall hurt or molest;" well assured, that in no other way can he contribute any thing towards "softening down the harsh contrast now existing between the *actual* and the *ideal*," which he rejoices to know "will finally be lost sight of, in the full establishment of the kingdom of Heaven, upon the earth."

2. In what just and impressive language does Mr. Woods describe the necessity, under which the reformer is placed, incessantly and vigorously to employ himself in his appropriate work! He is not content with *asserting* the necessity; he conducts us to the ground, from which it springs. The progress of human affairs demands frequently the readjustment of human arrangements. Provision must be made, continually and liberally, for the "rising wants and advancing stages of human society." *Reform*, neglected or resisted, opens the way for *revolution*. Human depravity, moreover, Mr. Woods will not permit us to forget, is continually busy in making work for the hands of the reformer. So "various are the abuses," which it works into "both civil and religious institutions," that, unless restrained, it may reduce even such "blessings" into "scourges." Indeed, Mr. W. would have us understand, that the "proclivity" to such results as he speaks of, is something more than a metaphysical abstraction. It has found body, life and action in "the evils, which man *has suffered and continues to suffer*, from the abuse of the civil and ecclesiastical power, ordained for his benefit." These evils, Mr. Woods ventures with startling emphasis, to assert, "are IMMEASURABLY *greater* than those, which have befallen him from *any other source*;" and adds, as a natural and just inference—an inference of the most *practical* character—that "the call for their correction is proportionably loud;"—that is "*immeasurably*" louder than the call for the correction of evils, arising from "any other source." The most eager, bold and strenuous reformer, could hardly find language more pointed and powerful, to describe the work, to which he had devoted his time and his strength.

3. The work of reform, we are much pleased to find, Mr. W. regards as naturally appropriate to every man, woman and child; who may engage in "the business of doing good." To the doctrine which he here teaches, we most heartily subscribe. It is, in our view, clearly the doctrine of the Bible. It is delightful to hear Mr. W. say, *Indeed in a state of imperfection like ours, the business of doing good, seems of necessity, to take, for the most part, the shape of reform.*" What a wide field of exertion is here thrown open before us! What various and exhausting labors are we here required to perform! How extended the harvest, here to be gathered. Here is a work, which for "the most part," comprehends, ay, "*of necessity*" comprehends the "business of doing good." Who, then, may engage in a work so heavenly and honorable?—so benign in its tendencies, so happy in its influence, so useful in its results, that Mr. W. is disposed to assign to it, the "highest place among all the departments of human beneficence." Who? Why EVERY MAN, who would expend his resources, and employ his powers, "in the business of doing good." From this business, he must "*of necessity*," for "the most part," be excluded, if he refuses to be a reformer. And how can he refuse? What, refuse to aid in removing those evils, which have fallen upon afflicted humanity with a crushing force, "*immeasurably greater*" than those that have befallen it "*from any other source*"! And this, when "*the call to this work is immeasurably louder*" than any other which falls upon his ear, and demands his activity! He must then, whoever he may be—be a stupid, or sordid, cowardly wretch, who is dead to the wants and woes of human nature, though weltering in its own blood!

4. The application of his doctrine "to the enemies of seasonable and needful changes," Mr. W. ventures boldly to make. Upon these "obstinate conservatives of every abuse," he seasonably and earnestly urges the startling thought, that *to them* "the horrors of revolution are to be charged, more than to the infatuated multitude, who are its immediate agents and victims." This we regard as a fair application of a sound and weighty doctrine. Let every man who refuses to engage in the work of reform—a work "which" Mr. W. reminds us, "*needs to be as incessant*" as the insidious encroachments of corruption,"—take it home to his inmost soul, before it falls in thunder-claps upon his ears. We

pray God to save us from a condemnation so just and dreadful, as Mr. W. warns us to beware of! In behalf of all his readers, we thank him for his well-timed and pointed admonition.

We are now to contemplate Mr. W. in a new position. How he arrived there, we are quite at a loss to determine. The maxims, doctrines, and movements, which in the one position and the other, he proposes and commends, seem to us to be subversive of each other. Among the arts of sophistry few are better adapted to mislead and embarrass than the art of making distinctions on the one hand, where none in reality exist; and on the other, of confounding things, which naturally stand separate from each other. In this art, we are sorry to say, Mr. W. deserves the reputation of a distinguished adept. He finds it convenient to make a marked distinction between the "immediate offices of religion" and the "function of the true reformer." Both he invests with such an air of awfulness, as might be supposed to hang over the ruins of the Holy of Holies. In the spirit of the solemn bird of night screaming among such ruins, Mr. W. warns "*the unbidden*" to beware of the "profaneness" of "meddling with the fundamental institutions of civil government and religion." To what, we humbly ask, does this distinction with the terrific conclusion, appended to it amount? In the light, which Mr. W. himself has shed upon it, we hesitate not to pronounce it infinitely less than an airy abstraction. In "meddling" with the institution of religion, according to Mr. W., the authorized reformer discharges a "function" almost as "high and sacred" as "the immediate offices of religion"! In the work of reform Luther and Calvin and Knox occupied ground almost as high and sacred, as that, to which the "immediate offices of religion" naturally conducted them! And so, the "function" of a religious reformer is no religious "office"! And yet that "function," though less high and sacred than a religious office, "unbidden hands" must beware of assuming, lest they involve themselves *almost* in the guilt of sacrilege! If any reader supposes, that we wrong Mr. W. in ascribing to him such nonsense, let him read and "inwardly digest" such statements as the following: "If it is true as we believe, that after the immediate offices of religion, there is no function on earth higher or more sacred than that of

the true reformer, it follows, that after sacrilege, there is nothing more profane, than with rash and unbidden hands to meddle with the fundamental institutions of civil government and religion." Now along by the side of this, let us lay the following statements of Mr. W. in the same paper, and contemplate their mutual bearing on each other. "To a wise political or ecclesiastical reform, we are disposed to assign the highest place among all the departments of human beneficence. *Indeed in a state of imperfection like ours, THE BUSINESS OF DOING GOOD SEEMS OF NECESSITY to take, for the most part, THE SHAPE OF REFORM.*" Those who are *bidden* to do good must then, if they would obey God, be "for the most part," REFORMERS; and reformers too in matters "political and ecclesiastical." To place this matter in a clear light, a scene like the following may not be altogether inappropriate. An inquirer, intent on "doing good," with marked modesty and deep reverence approaches Mr. Woods.

Inquirer. Reverend Sir, I profess to be a christian. My Bible has strongly fastened the conviction upon my mind, that to the "business of doing good," I am unceasingly, heartily, and strenuously to devote all my powers and resources. Will you, as a public teacher, kindly suggest to me the *modes*, in which I am to expend my strength?

Mr. Woods. "In a state of imperfection like ours, the business of doing good seems of necessity to take, for the most part, *the SHAPE of reform.*"

Inquirer. I am charged with the responsibilities of a reformer. These responsibilities are laid upon me by the strong hand of "*necessity.*" There is no escape from their pressure. Let me then in the spirit of my profession welcome them. From this day onward to the close of my connection with "a state of imperfection like ours," be it mine, as reformer, to maintain an incessant warfare with evil, under every form and name; and as my "aim and standard" to endeavor to raise human nature to "that blissful state, in which nothing shall hurt or molest."

Mr. Woods. Take care what you do! You ought to be "aware of the difference between an ideal and real republic, and that it is far easier to adjust the plastic and aerial elements of the former to fine spun theories, than the grosser and intractable materials of the latter." I charge you,

solemnly charge you to remember, that "after the immediate offices of religion there is no function on earth higher or more sacred than that of the true reformer." Take home then to your inmost soul the awful admonition, that "after sacrilege, there is nothing more profane, than with rash and unbidden hands to meddle with the fundamental institutions of civil government and religion."

Inquirer. Sir, you greatly shock and embarrass me.—What am I to do? I pant to engage in the "business of doing good." Such desires moreover accord with—nay, spring from those convictions, which my Bible has wrought into the very texture of my spirit. You have taught me, that if I would do good, I *must* act the part of a reformer. As such, you bade me "aim" at nothing less than the introduction of that "blissful state, in which nothing shall hurt or molest." And now, about to give myself with a "hearty good will" to action, you direct my eye from so high an aim and deter me from so good a work, by trying to scare me with sepulchral groans about "unbidden hands," and "profaneness," and almost "sacrilege." If my exertions do not take the shape of reform—and reform too in matters "political and ecclesiastical," for these you yourself expressly specify—I must for ought I can see, for the "most part of necessity" do just nothing at all or give up myself to "the business of doing" *evil*. Would you ply me with temptation such as the honorable mayor* of a certain great city, "in the precincts of that august temple, where law and religion sit enthroned," urged upon a colored man of integrity and enterprize? His honor would not permit him to engage

* The following is an exact report of a conversation which took place in one of our cities between the magistrate who grants licenses and a colored man who applied for a license to drive a cart.

C. Will your honor grant me a license to drive a cart.

M. Are there any colored men who drive carts?

C. I do not know sir.

M. It is not customary for colored men to drive carts.

C. Not if they can produce as good recommendations of character as white men?

M. Let me see your recommendation. It is a very good one, but ———

C. Is it good enough to obtain a license to sell rum, sir?

M. O yes: go to the alderman of the ward in which you live and he will attend to you, we grant colored men tavern licenses.

C. I don't want to sell rum, sir, I want to get an honest living. Is my unfortunate color the cause of your honor's refusing to grant me a license to get an honest living?

M. I cannot hold any argument on that subject; it will not change my mind.
—[See Anti-Slavery Record, vol. I, p. 68.]

in a useful employment, for which he was strongly recommended as well qualified; but his honor was quite ready to *license him to sell rum!*

In opposition to Mr. Woods, we shall not hesitate to take the part of Mr. Woods in saying, that any such distinction as he makes between the offices of religion and the function of the reformer must be as mischievous as it is groundless. It is the act "of an enemy," to break up the Christian community into castes, on the ground, that the appropriate work of some is too high and sacred to be approached by others. Is there in heaven or on earth any employment more honorable or holy than the "*business of doing good*"? And is any man to be deterred from this by the notes of some officious night-bird dolefully screaming in his ears, "*profaneness*," "*sacrilege*"? It is very true, that every man should seek to occupy a station, suited to his talents and acquirements. But he is bound, whoever he may be and wherever and however he may exert himself, to bring his entire being, in every design and in every movement into full and direct subserviency to the great object, for which Jehovah lives and reigns. Whatever may be his sphere of action, he thus becomes in the noblest sense of the phrase, *a priest of the most high God*. It is profane—it is sacrilegious for any of his fellow-laborers, to thrust him away from the altar on the ground, that he is a "common and unclean thing," and brings his offering with "unbidden hands." Magisterial pride and sacerdotal insolence may rudely interfere with him, in "the business of doing good." "Lording it over the heritage of God," they may try to break up his plans and counteract his exertions, on the pretence, that reform is a work too high and sacred for him. But this they cannot do, while he remembers the dignity, and privileges, and responsibilities of his high calling: "*Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should shew forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light.*"

"The fundamental institutions of civil government and of religion" are not "to be meddled with with unbidden hands." Who are they, that bring this warning to our ears? Are they an order of superior beings, shining with angel wings? No. They are our own brethren and fellows. How came they to hold the offices, political or

ecclesiastical, to which they may have been raised? Our readers may remember the rebuke, by which the bloated Justice of the peace was suddenly reduced to his proper size, when, not knowing what he did, he turned up his nose at William Penn. "My friend here," said the traveling companion of the insulted governor; "*My friend here MAKES such things as thou art.*" The unprivileged classes among us may choose to remember, that they *made* those big, noisy things, that are so loth to be "meddled with." And if, instead of securing the sympathy and aid of guardian angels, they have been calling spirits from "the vasty deep" to haunt, and worry, and devour them, they have indeed been ill-employed.

If in this country, the "fundamental institutions of civil government and religion" were to have any "seasonable and needful changes" wrought into them, will Mr. Woods tell us *by whom* they may be fairly "meddled with." If he would not think it "profaneness" in us amounting almost to "sacrilege" to propose such a problem, we would say; suppose, that the Constitution of the United States should need some emendation. After leaving out of the account all "unbidden hands," upon whom would this task, so "high and sacred," devolve? What a number of reformers in this case would "of necessity" come forward in every part of the republic to occupy their places in this elevated "department of human beneficence"! Suppose in any of the New England States—say Maine, where Mr. Woods may yet occupy the chair of a theological professor, the work of reform should be applied to the institutions of religion; will Mr. Woods inform us how many *bidden* hands would naturally—nay, "of necessity," be employed in this "function"! Amidst his German authors, whom we blame him not for studying, Mr. Woods seems in writing the article under review to have forgotten, under what sort of government he lived. We are tempted to suppose, that a fond preference for its arrangements had somehow conducted him in imagination into the midst of "*the Prussian Government*"!—a government, which like an *iron bedstead*, if modified at all, may very probably be "*gradually*" reformed. We hope, that before he takes his leave of the emperor, he will visit the good NEANDER; and catch enough of his spirit, to become ashamed of the distinction, he makes, between the

function of an ecclesiastical reformer and the offices of religion.

Why should the truth, as obvious as it is important, ever be forgotten, that the efficiency, nay, the very *life* of our political and ecclesiastical institutions depends under God upon public sentiment? In opposition to this, what civil or religious arrangement can be maintained? What are constitutions, what are statutes, when the breath "of the people" ceases to animate them? The roll of parchment or the printed page may preserve the form of them in full size and solemn pace. But neither the page nor the parchment will in this case give us the history of the living, but the epitaph of the dead. What in a country like this is law against the will of the people? A dead letter, clearly. Now, we ask, where is the man, who has no share in forming, and therefore no responsibility for the character and tendency of, *public sentiment*? Why, what is public sentiment? What, but the views and feelings of a community, generally and comprehensively considered? Who maintain these views; who cherish these feelings? Some superior being, who in awful state sits apart from human creatures; unapproachable, formidable, immutable? So they seem to think, who, as they approach the deep darkness in which this divinity of their imagination is veiled, "lay their hands upon their mouth and their mouths in the dust;" reverently waiting for the oracle to speak, that they may echo every solemn syllable it may mutter. These are the men who quake at the thought of getting in advance of public sentiment; who, like dead fish in a stream, passively follow wherever it may lead. Those, who maintain the views and cherish the feelings which compose public sentiment in any community, are the men, women, and children of which that community is made. *Each of these at every breath affects public sentiment.* It is not only accessible to them all; but all are continually and "of necessity" engaged in modifying and moulding it. Wax before the fire is not more yielding. Now for the work of reformation. A plain farmer finds good reasons to conclude, that alcoholic drinks are injurious to the human constitution. But what shall he do? The minister, the squire, and the deacon all "take a little" for the sake of their dear stomachs. If *he* refuses, he will commence a reformation. At the hazard of being classed with the "profane" for

attempting a work so high and sacred, he ventures to dash the tempting poison to the ground. But his sons and workmen; may he give them his reasons for totally abstaining from the use of alcohol? This would be to take a second step in the progress of reform. He trembles at the thought of "sacrilege" in thus approaching what might be regarded as the offices of religion; but he trembles more lest his sons should stumble into drunkards' graves. The deacon will not speak; the squire will not speak; the minister will not speak. Public sentiment is in favor of alcohol. But *he* cannot keep silence. He exposes the noxious influence and damning tendency of intoxicating liquor, and banishes it from his fields and table. Now he begins to feel a tender and lively concern for one of his "near neighbors," who has just mortgaged his farm to the rum-seller. He modestly suggests to the squire, he humbly intreats the minister, to try to rouse his poor neighbor to the dangers, multiplied and frightful, which are thickening around him. But they very gravely warn the unofficial advocate of temperance to beware of "a childish and feverish impatience for immediate results"; and bid him maintain a manly composure and serene confidence in the ultimate prevalence of right over wrong;—in other words, a dignified indifference to the wants and woes of the vicious and degraded. But our farmer's heart is not fat enough for that: and so with a heavy spirit and a tearful eye, he undertakes the work, which the justice and the divine are too serene and composed to attempt. He meets with happy success in his noble design; and greatly encouraged and cheered, he advances from step to step in the work of reform, until the way is opened for the "best part" of the parish to come together and form a temperance society. He is now at length happily delivered from the danger of involving himself in the guilt of profaneness or sacrilege; for the squire condescendingly enters on the "function" of president of the new association and the minister piously takes upon himself the "religious offices" thereof.

Take another case. In traveling in Kentucky, a young man from New-York becomes thoroughly convinced, that slaveholding is a crime. In conversation with a gentleman of Kentucky, whose hospitality he enjoys, he gives expression to his views and feelings. He breaks up the "serenity

and composure" of his host, who, stung with conscious guilt, emancipates his slaves. Alarmed and irritated, his neighbors demand his reasons for the step, they have seen him take. He frankly and clearly and fully explains the grounds of the proceeding, which had so perplexed and embarrassed them. But what is the result? Why, one and another of his neighbors, after a short and violent struggle with their pride and selfishness, enter into his views and feelings. They all knock the fetters from the heels of their bondmen; and to extend and increase their influence in the cause of holy freedom, form themselves into an anti-slavery society. Now the work of reform advances apace, and attracts general attention. The greatest obstacles to its speedy and glorious consummation are thrown in its way by those men of high authority in church and state, whose composure* and serenity are never disturbed by the tears and groans, and blood of the oppressed; but who are always thrown into "a childish and fevered impatience, regardless alike of public faith and private rights," whenever they witness any decided effort to promote the welfare of the suffering and the dumb.

The plain truth is, that every man, woman, and child, on finding himself involved in "evil doing" is bound by obligations as high and sacred as the authority of God, immediately to "break off his sin by righteousness." Under the same obligations, he must do "what he can" to bring others to harmonize with him in views, feelings, and action. He will thus "of necessity" extend his influence to a circle continually widening. Others feeling the force of his convictions, will take their position by his side; others again by theirs; till scores, hundreds, thousands occupy common ground with him. This is a just description of the work of reform. It may commence with the obscurest child in the community, and ultimately reach the gravest philosopher or statesman, or divine. If we are not mistaken, we have the authority of church history for saying, that christianity has often in this way exerted its influence and diffused its benefits. The most important reformations have thus begun

* "*Why should I care*"? The reverend doctor of divinity, who was the "humble instrument" of doing *so much* to bring to the birth that "*twin sister*" (as he styled it) of the *American Bible Society*;—viz. the *American Colonization Society*. This society seems to have had its origin in a *why-should-I-care* spirit about the miseries of the slave.

with the sewing-maid in the kitchen. Let no one then be deterred from acting the part of a reformer by the senseless insinuation, from whatever bloated body it may proceed, that "the scribes and pharisees have not believed on him."

Mr. Woods, not only makes needless and mischievous distinctions, inconsistent with the ground, which he himself had been maintaining; he also in the same breath unhappily confounds things, which should have been carefully distinguished, this he does in his vague and general description of "*radicalism*." With the very name of this, how is he horror-struck!—a name we doubt not, of dreadful import to most of his refined and polished readers. Mr. Woods seems well enough to know, that "in a state of imperfection like ours," *names* go a great way in making things attractive or repulsive; and that they often then produce the most effect when they are least understood. He doubtless has seen and heard, amidst the roar and rush of a New-York mob the practical bearing of such appellations, as "fanatics," "incendiaries," "black mormons of the East," liberally bestowed upon some of his most intelligent fellow-citizens and devoted fellow-christians by *distinguished gentlemen* under the protection of a public sentiment, themselves had been active in forming. Perhaps he would shudder at the thought of conducting the popular mind from names to things, lest with "profane and unbidden hands" he should assume the "function of a reformer." At any rate, after all he says about "*radicalism*," we are left to grope in vain for something definite amidst the darkness of his generalities.

The defects, which in any institution may attract the attention and demand the hand of the reformer, may be either 1, arrangements, which in the progress of things from one point in the history of a community to another *have become unnecessary and useless*. Or, 2, arrangements, in which important objects are *awkwardly and unskilfully pursued*.—In the construction and furniture of a church, in the dress, position, mode of instruction, maintained by the preacher, time and taste may have made many things useless, which were once deemed highly important. Moreover a good end may be sought by a round-about and tedious process. What can be more important than public prayer? *Unhappy modes* may, however, be prescribed and adopted. And yet

a strong attachment may prevail among a people both to the useless and the awkward. The "blessed wig" and venerable three-cornered hat of the preacher may in the minds of many have become intimately associated with the great Bible. Others may hardly know how, especially in public, to pray without the prayer-book. In such cases, we are ready to admit, that the "true reformer" would proceed with great caution gradually to remove the defects, which called for his skill and efforts. But 3, an institution may be marked by defects of a very different character. *Arrangements directly and flagrantly at variance with the divine requisitions may arrest the attention and rouse the spirit of the "true reformer."* Such arrangements he will regard as nothing less than *specific modes of sinning*. And from whatever exigencies they may seem to have arisen; by whatever authority they may claim to be sustained; and however they may have been forced into unnatural union with other things, he will not for a moment shew them the slightest favor. He knows well enough, that there can be no mode—there can be no time, in which sin can be well committed: that the rights of God or man cannot be so invaded—under some such happy modification or at such a happy juncture—as to render the act innocent and tolerable. He knows full well, that sin, under all its forms, in all its relations, and with all its influences and tendencies, is hurtful—only hurtful, and hurtful continually. Whatever it touches, it distorts, pollutes, and blasts. If it has been permitted or encouraged—no matter by whom or on what occasion—to creep into any institution, political or ecclesiastical—he knows that it must work mischief there during every moment of its continuance. It is like some quick and deadly poison in the human system. With every throb of the heart, it more deeply and fatally infects the blood. Where such defects are concerned, the true reformer is a stern, unsparing, and determined *radicalist*. He applies "the axe to the roots" of the evil. He abhors the thought, of spending his time, and strength, and skill in modifying sin. He would as soon attempt to transform "Satan into an angel of light" by the application of paint and varnish. Delicately modify, gradually ameliorate as you will—*sin remains sin*—malignant, hurtful, noxious. And a reformation, any where and at any time, which consists in reducing

the form and softening the features of rebellion against God may be justly described in the plain, homely, pointed language of *Jonathan Edwards*: It is letting into the place of a black devil seven white ones.

We hope we may be forgiven if we frankly say, what we deeply feel, that the Christian cause is greatly injured by the marked and obvious inconsistency of some of the professed advocates of the doctrine of immediate repentance. For the maintainancé and prevalence of this doctrine *in the abstract*, they are zealous enough. If a grave and dignified metaphysician, under the pressure of such responsibilities as a professor's chair in a theological school imposes on him, ventures however cautiously to describe the states of mind, which, not, as he reminds us, *in the order of time* but of nature succeed each other in repentance, what an alarm is taken and sounded! Warnings loud and frequent ring through the land, That *heresy in the form of the DOCTRINE OF GRADUAL REPENTANCE* is "coming in like a flood." And yet denouncers and denounced; the orthodox and the heretic can join hands in *PRACTICALLY* maintaining this very doctrine in the worst form, it could well assume. Violations of the rights of God and man—open, habitual, flagrant—they see reduced to a system horribly strong and regular;—a system defended in the pulpit and applauded in the legislature; and the moment their own doctrine of immediate repentance is applied to the supporters of this system, they start back with horror. Alas! they exclaim, this will never do. It is carrying things quite too far. And then the hurtful tendencies and mischievous effects of preaching and practising this doctrine are described in language as grave, as pointed, as emphatic, as the exposure and reprobation of the worst heresy in the world could require! Of all this, what a striking illustration we have in the alarm and opposition, which the doctrines and designs and movements of the friends of immediate emancipation have produced! What have these men done;—what do they propose to do? Why, they have shown in the clearest and most certain light, that slaveholding is *a sin*—a giant crime, most malignant, hateful and destructive; that repentance only can save us from its damning guilt and deadly tendencies; that repentance should be exercised without the least delay, and should, therefore, be immediately, earnestly, promptly urged

upon the conscience of every man, woman, and child, who is concerned directly or indirectly in supporting or countenancing the oppression of the enslaved. In accordance with the convictions they feel, and the doctrines they maintain, they have resolved under God *to act*. They are, therefore, laboring with some degree of zeal and effect, to persuade their fellow-citizens, and especially their fellow-christians, to unite with them in rescuing, by means authorized by the Bible and countenanced by the political institutions of their country, the bondman from the grasp of the oppressor. All their plans and exertions are carefully and fully adjusted to the doctrine of immediate repentance. For these things how many of the professed advocates of this doctrine have been forward to deride, malign, and oppose them!

Mr. Woods complains, that the spirit of radicalism is driving out of "many of our colleges and theological seminaries those dispositions, which become all students, especially students in divinity." How much and what he meant by this ill-natured insinuation, it is not for us to guess. We can easily suppose a cause. A professor of divinity, remarkable for his ingenuity, and occasional display of warmth, elasticity and force of mind, with a high reputation for theological learning and pulpit eloquence, finds himself surrounded by "students in divinity," whom he is to mould for the labors of the pulpit. In lofty strains and with great power, he urges them to hold with a strong grasp and proclaim with a loud voice the doctrine of immediate repentance. Deal with sinners, I hear him say, deal with sinners of all sorts only on the basis of this doctrine. Bring them to see and feel, that now is the time to renounce and abandon their iniquities. Give them no quarter. You may preach *gradual* repentance till dooms'-day and have nothing but your pains for your labor. Every word the grave professor utters in this strain falls on open ears—finds free access to their inmost hearts. Like men of business, they resolve to act upon the doctrines of their revered instructor. At length, amidst their various investigations of the different subjects, which claim their attention, they become thoroughly convinced, that slaveholding is a sin. Some of their own number are at present or in prospect slaveholders; and all are directly or indirectly and in various ways connected

with the system of oppression, which they cannot but regard as equally wicked, infamous, and destructive. They immediately take measures to bring the doctrine of immediate repentance to bear upon this whole matter. With filial confidence and love, they seek the sympathy, and countenance, and aid of their instructor, who had so eloquently and effectually impressed upon their minds the doctrine, on which they are now acting. But alas, they are disappointed, mortified, and shocked to find, that the reverend doctor is disposed to shrink from the practical application of the truth, of which, as an abstract affair, he was so zealous and so able an advocate. The threatening attitude of angry sinners in his vicinity has already filled him with alarm and affright. He exhorts the "students of divinity," who have disturbed the consciences of these transgressors to desist. Nay, he lends his countenance to measures, which are designed *to force* them to hold their tongues and stop their efforts! Such treatment, we should think, might well be expected to "drive out before it those dispositions, which become all students, especially students of divinity." Perhaps Mr. W. had his eye on some such case, as we have been supposing.

In this connection, we shall be permitted to say, that we were much surprised with a reference, which in describing the position of the true reformer at the commencement of his career, Mr. Woods professes to make "to the Scriptures." The phraseology, he employs enabled us to determine with tolerable certainty what passage, he would recall to our thoughts. By comparing that passage with his statement, our readers can hardly fail to perceive how much confidence and credit he is entitled to, for his conscientiousness and accuracy in using scriptural authority.

MR. WOODS.

"According to the Scriptures, he (the true reformer) makes his stand UPON THE *ancient way*; THENCE he looks about, to discover what is *the right way*, and so walks in it."

JEREMIAH vi. 16.

Thus saith the Lord; Stand ye IN THE *WAYS*, and *ask for the old paths*, where is the *good way*, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls,

Mr. Woods, in accordance with the public sentiment of the circle, to which he seems "for better or for worse" to have attached himself, places his reformer UPON the ancient way; the Scriptures bid him stand at the point, where "the ways" meet—"in the *WAYS*." From the ancient way Mr.

Woods' reformer looks about to discover the "right way"; whereas, according to the Scriptures, the phrases "old paths" and "good way" describe the same road. Mr. Woods and his authority however happily agree in describing the reformer as something more than a "tongue-valiant" hero, who is eager bravely to expend never so much wind in contending with naughty abstractions;—he resolutely "WALKS THEREIN" when his eyes are once blessed with the sight of "*the good way*"—though in so doing, he may be obliged to walk away from a "theological seminary." "According to the Scriptures," we are required amidst conflicting opinions and designs and pursuits, earnestly to inquire, and resolutely too seek for the ends and objects; the plans and methods to which the God of holiness would have us devote our strength and our resources. On the foundations of the universe and in his sacred word, he has clearly and impressively described "the old paths—the good way." And when we have discovered amidst the various relations we sustain what is *the will of God*, we are to make that will the very basis of all our designs, and methods, and exertions.

"According to the Scriptures," then we are required,

1. By earnest inquiry and thorough examination, to seek the "good way;"

2. When found, to walk therein; and

3. To expect in so doing "rest for our souls."

This was precisely the course pursued by the "students, and especially the students in divinity" in one of the "theological seminaries" "among us." They "stood in the ways" and on a most important subject where many of the wise and the good were benighted and embarrassed "*asked*," with great sincerity and earnestness and pathos "*asked*, for the old paths"—paths opened and defined in eternity by the unerring Hand;—and when the "*good way*" shone brightly before them, they ventured without hesitation or delay "to walk therein." With a strong unyielding hand, they pushed their inquiries right on in a straight line to just and sound conclusions; and these conclusions they proclaimed both with their lips and in their lives. "For these causes," they were now reproached as sturdy rebels, though they had broken no law, violated no just authority; now they were ridiculed as noisy "boys," though they wielded the powers of mature age; and finally, they were pitied as the victims

of "monomania"; though none "of their adversaries were able to resist the wisdom and the spirit, by which they spake."

In another case, which has attracted no little attention, inquiry and discussion on a most important practical concern, to ascertain the "good way," was introduced and encouraged by *the faculty* of a collegial and theological institution. But the enemies of free discussion and thorough reformation were greatly displeased. They were as captious, illnatured, unprincipled and violent in their opposition, as the bad cause in which they were engaged, could well make them. Falsehoods, equally gross, silly, and malignant, invented to injure that faculty, were not only put into circulation; but published as on "the best authority" in the* official journal of a professedly benevolent society, which by a late doctor of divinity on a great occasion was shown, *in his way*, to be "twin-sister of the American Bible Society." How difficult it is to suit evil doers in the methods, which may be employed to expose their ill-designs?

The General Assembly of the church, to which Mr. W. is understood to belong, ought not to be slow to take the hint, which clearly belongs to them, when he throws out the suggestion for the benefit doubtless of "all whom it may concern" that the bad spirit, he describes, "has crossed the track of many of our benevolent enterprises, disturbing their counsels, dividing their friends, and putting a stop to the good they were doing." Many of the doctors, who are so bitterly opposed to the *great voluntary associations* of the church, we doubt not are Mr. Woods' constant and admiring readers. We hope they will take in good part, and turn to good account, the admonition to which they are so justly entitled, and which they so greatly need. A word to the wise is sufficient.

But others have been charged with "crossing the track and disturbing the counsels of" some of "our benevolent enterprizes." The friends of the colored American, in their

* See the African Repository, for Oct. 1833, p. 245, 6. The statement, there published, Prof. Green over his own name pronounced *false*; and called on Mr. Gurley, the editor of the African Repository, to describe the authority, on which it was made. This Mr. G. has hitherto neglected to do. After *some eighteen months*, the Secretary of the Trustees of the Western Reserve College admitted, that the statement, complained of, *was false*. Will Mr. Gurley now let the public know, on whose authority such a silly lie was told in the Repository?

united exertions to raise him among his fellow citizens to his proper level, have ventured respectfully and earnestly to request the American Bible Society to see to it, that the holy volume, according to the solemn resolutions of that institution, be offered to every family in the republic. This request, though it brought those, who urged it, to the attitude of entreaty, seems to have been regarded by not a few, as involving an attack upon the Bible Society! We have reason to know, that the abolitionists have been solemnly warned against repeating such a request, on the ground that they would excite against the good cause, in which they were enlisted, a great deal of prejudice and opposition! However you may explain yourselves, we have been assured, you will be represented and regarded, as waging war upon that sublime institution, which has the reverence and the confidence of the whole nation. And so, to intreat the Bible Society to place the sacred volume within the reach of the injured, the degraded, and the wretched, is to wage war upon it! That is, we wage war upon the Bible Society in presenting to its compassionate regard those very objects, which are embraced in its appropriate design! The institution is so sacred, so venerable, so deeply rooted in the hearts of all the churches of our land, that we may not lead up our poor, persecuted black brother, and humbly ask that a crumb of mercy may be given him! The oppressor is a patron of the Bible Society; and he will be offended if the victims of his rapacity are pitied!—But the law forbids the slave to read the Bible! Horrible, most horrible! Could a law framed in Hell more directly and flagrantly oppose the designs of Heaven! And is the church to witness the damning influence of such laws without pity, disgust, and indignation! But how are these emotions, with correspondent action, to be produced? Treading in the foot-prints of the “priest and Levite,” are we to turn away from our brother, leaving him “half dead” in the hands of the thieves, who have stripped him, and wounded him, and now stand over his bleeding body, to deprive him of any kind offices, which humanity might offer? No, let the Bible be offered, again and again, to all, who *ought* to read its pages. If they are forbidden, or unable to do so, let the petty tyrants, who keep them in ignorance and chains, be constrained, again and again, before the eyes of the nation, to belch out

their blasphemies, and swing their cart-whips! Abused and resisted mercy will at length rouse up, and plead with energy and effect the cause of the oppressed.

After all, what are the *elements* of this institution, which we must approach with so much lowliness and reverence? We own we have been amused with the mutual relation of things, which a little attention to this inquiry forced upon our notice. The same men, who were warned to beware of pressing their petitions upon the Bible Society, lest they should profanely approach, and rudely touch a thing too sacred for "unbidden hands to meddle with," find that **THEY THEMSELVES**, as truly as any of the children of Adam, *are members of this institution*. They help compose what is too hallowed and venerable for them to address, even in the language of supplication! *As members of one society, they must uncover their heads, and reverently bow, with their fingers on their lips, to THEMSELVES, as members of another society!*

Mr. Woods, in his vague and misty way, gravely tells us, that in this country, "*the State—THE Church*, are laid open with unsuspecting frankness, to the view and touch of the *whole nation*." True enough. But **BY WHOM?** To whose condescension is the nation indebted for this wonderful privilege? Why, to *their own!* The task, which in this country every man has the responsibility of performing, is most graciously placed beneath his eye, and within his reach! The nation is magnanimously pleased to permit the nation to see what the nation is a-doing! And so the people, unsuspectingly allowing the people to see what the people are about, may, taking advantage of the liberty which the people have granted to the people, go on to modify, and reform, and radically amend the doings of the people! We would humbly suggest to Mr. Woods, whenever he may take up his pen again to write down the radicals, to dedicate his paragraphs to prince Metternich.

We will endeavor, however, to remember, for high and holy purposes, what Mr. Woods reminds us of, that "every institution among us moves pliantly, hither and thither, with every blast of the popular will." We know that well enough. The foulest customs, the worst usages, the bloodiest laws in the republic, might, with a single blast of the popular will, be scattered to the winds. Such a blast we will not cease

earnestly to invoke. Let it come. It may under God save the nation from a premature and dishonored grave. While we have tongue or pen, God forbid that we should cease to importune our fellow-citizens to "will" the utter destruction of every moral evil, which has insinuated itself into any of our institutions, political or ecclesiastical !

As to the "levelling and disorganizing spirit" of which Mr. Woods complains, we ask, *whom does it possess?* Whom has this demon entered? Clearly the ruffians who have employed the mob to worry and devour the fast, unflinching friends of human nature. We can never forget by whose influence, and under what pretences, thousands of poor thoughtless creatures were goaded on to those shameless excesses and enormities, which have recently disgraced some of our principal towns and cities. We can never forget under whose banner they fought. The wretches who set them on, alike unprincipled and insolent, supporting, and wielding an abused press, arrogated to themselves the prerogative of dictating to their fellow-citizens what they might think and speak. To refuse to bow to their dictation was a crime, to be punished by the rabble at their heels. If Mr. Woods had these creatures, with their broadcloth and their ruffles,—their sleek faces, and fat hearts, in his eye, as possessed of a levelling and disorganizing spirit," he has, indeed, hit his mark. These are *radicals* in the worst sense of the word; the foul enemies of good order, who would turn law and justice out of doors. Professed disciples of the meek and lowly Saviour, though some of them are known to be, what honest man must not exclaim, from the bottom of a loathing and indignant heart,—“O my soul, come not thou into their secret; to their assembly, my honor, be not thou united. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel.”

But if Mr. W. designed to throw his censures upon his fellow-citizens, who in spite of the cord of caste, insist on treating every man according to his moral worth, he may rest assured, that they will regard his censures as devoid of point or force.* To such a standard, Mr. W. and all his readers, however tenacious they may now be of those factitious distinctions which seem to give them a momentary

* “*Telum imbelle sine ictu.*”

consequence, must soon bow, or flee beyond the limits of *His* holy government, who sternly denies that He is "a respecter of persons." Such a standard, we are well aware, will "*level*" every high thing which exalteth itself against God, and "*disorganize*" every band of wickedness. Those who dread such results, doubtless have *their reasons* for their objections. *Real worth must always scorn factitious distinctions.* It does not claim respect for its features and complexion; for its coat and boots; for its coach and horses. It distinguishes between a *man* and his *color*; a man and his *clothes*. When, therefore, some bloated creature requires us to clear the way before his white face and powdered locks, alledging, in set phrase and big words, that those who have been darkened by the sun, or pinched by poverty, owe him reverence and homage,—we cannot be to blame for guessing, that he has nothing better to boast of than his complexion and his clothes.

We must not ourselves forget—we must not fail to remind our readers, that Mr. W. has condensed we know not what amount of thought in the grave and imposing form of a "*MAXIM.*" By this, he is careful to inform us, *his* "reformer is always governed in his efforts;" and "in the observance of this, he is most widely distinguished from the whole tribe of radical innovators and revolutionists." Our readers cannot but desire to enrich themselves at this mine of massive, precious ore, which Mr. W. has generously laid open to the public eye. "*The maxim is this,—to begin his efforts, and to employ them chiefly, in correcting the dispositions in which the particular evil to be removed has originated, rather than in a direct attack upon the evil itself.*" The occasion which led Mr. W. to the sublime discovery of this maxim, seems to have been somewhat like the following:—He observed that the particular evil of rum selling had its "origin in the depraved dispositions of the human heart." This evil was "assailed," directly and powerfully "assailed." "An explosion of human passion" was thus "provoked." The heart of the rum-seller was reached and wounded. He took fire. He raved, and raged, and "imagined" a thousand dreadful "things." Now, what could be more natural—what more philosophical than the conclusion, that every other particular evil, springing from the same origin, would, if assailed, enlist in its defence the

same tumultuous passions? Any effort to bruise the head of a single viper that nestled in it, would make the human heart swell with rage. And that was a result greatly to be dreaded. For human passions, thus aroused, must gather strength by the fearful exercise to which they had been provoked. "The angry elements of the human breast," thus awakened, might, "in their cruel and unsparing sweep" bear away whatever should venture to oppose. Alas, had "the noble army of martyrs" had their "judgment" corrected by Mr. Woods' weighty maxim, how many of them "might have been saved to the cause of truth and virtue"! For look ye, you must not attack any particular evil for fear of reaching and provoking the heart, from whence it proceeded. If you touch the heart, you provoke an explosion, which may blow you to atoms. You must, therefore, silently and cautiously and very gradually creep along some covert bye-path, at a great distance from any of those evils which the heart is pledged to protect, and just remove (observe, without touching the heart, as that would provoke the dreaded explosion)—"those depraved DISPOSITIONS OF THE HUMAN HEART," which are the root and "origin" of the evils you deplore. Thus according to our maxim-maker, if you touch a leaf or branch of any of its flourishing and fruitful evils, the heart will burn with rage; but if you remove the roots, that same heart will regard the process with meek and silent acquiescence. Here is a discovery "worth" proclaiming on the very house-tops!

But how are we to know, irrespective of the particular evils, in which they are embodied and presented, what are the "depraved dispositions of the heart." How but through "the fruit" it bears, can we ascertain the character of the "tree." Till expressed in the form of some "particular evil," any "depraved disposition," by which the heart may be infested, must be concealed from human observation. *Only through such evils, then, can we acquaint ourselves with such dispositions.* And how are we to produce in the bosom of any transgressor the salutary but painful conviction, that he has an evil heart? What methods shall we take? What arguments shall we urge? What illustrations employ? Can we do better than to direct his attention to the "particular evils" which mark his history? Through these, and these alone, can we hope to open his eyes upon

the "depraved dispositions of his heart." The evils then must be attacked and exposed, or the dispositions in which they originated can never be reached, much less corrected.

Nothing can be plainer or more certain, than that the reformers, whose doctrines, methods and movements are described in the Bible, acted on no such maxim as Mr. Woods proposes. They knew of no covert and concealed path, by which they might reach the heart and correct its depraved dispositions without a direct attack upon the particular evils, which sprung from thence. A single glance at the pages of Isaiah or Jeremiah or Hosea may be enough to convince any candid reader, that the prophets found their way to the human heart through the evils, to which it had given birth. What would our prudent maxim-maker and his admirers say of the official course of John the Baptist. Did that intrepid reformer cautiously avoid a "direct attack" upon the particular evils," which prevailed around him? For a time Herod himself seems to have been awed and delighted with the pointed, bold, and impressive eloquence of the Baptist. But he was not reformed. Habitually he indulged in guilty pleasures. *He retired from the feet of the holy prophet to the bed of his adulteress!* At length the "particular evil," of which he was guilty arrested the attention of the reformer, and the next thing we hear is the bold reproof, which fell upon the heart of Herod with the scorching, torturing effect of living coals: "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife!" Dare Mr. Woods, dare the men, with whom he sympathizes on the subject of reform, apply to John, as they see him led to prison and to death for his fidelity, those exclamations, in which they affect to lament the fate of zeal without discretion?

How, moreover, did our Saviour treat the "particular evils," which disgraced the age, which witnessed his crucifixion? Will our maxim-maker refer to the following pointed rebukes, which the Son of God urged upon the consciences and hearts of sinners, with whom he had to do, as illustrations of his own doctrines on the subject of reform? "Woe unto you, scribes, pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you scribes, pharisees, hypocrites! *for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers:*

therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. Woe unto you, scribes, pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one *proselyte*, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves. Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor. Ye fools and blind, for whether is greater the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And whosoever shall swear by the altar it is nothing, but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is on it, he is guilty. Ye fools and blind, for whether is greater, the gift or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whosoever therefore, shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it and by all things thereon. And whosoever shall swear by the temple sweareth by it and by him that dwelleth in it. And he that shall swear by heaven sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon. Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint, anise and cumin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, JUDGMENT, MERCY AND FAITH; these ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Woe unto you, scribes, and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind pharisee! cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outwardly, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye, also, outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, And say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. *Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell.*"

Had our Saviour adopted Mr. Woods' maxim and prac-

ticed the prudence, which he and his friends are so much distinguished for, instead of "rushing within the cruel and unsparing sweep of the angry elements, which" his fidelity had "awakened" in the bosoms of the wicked, he would have eagerly welcomed and anxiously retained the regal honors, which on one occasion were placed within His reach. Instead of dying the death of a slave He would have lived the life of a King. Will Mr. Woods venture to apply to Him the heartless exclamation: "How many, alas! have fallen victims to this mistaken method of reform, whom a better judgment might have saved to the cause of truth and virtue"?

To those, who are disposed to admire and adopt the maxim, to which we have so often adverted, we would venture, moreover, to commend the style of instruction, which in imitation of the example of his Lord, and in accordance with the methods of his fellow-apostles, James adopted. He opened his eye upon that "particular evil"—the source of multiplied hurtful influences—"respect of persons," which it seems had even in his day crept into the church, to waste its strength and mar its beauty. Upon this evil, he made a direct attack. Will Mr. Woods say for the want of a "better judgment"? "For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring and in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect unto him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place, and say unto the poor, Stand thou there, or, sit here under my footstool; are ye not then partial in yourselves, and have become judges of evil thoughts? But ye have despised the poor." With what wry faces would the bare reading of this homely passage fill those *Christian* assemblies, which would be most forward politely to bow assent to the *wise* maxim of our *reformer-maker*!

Where was any moral evil ever removed from the face of the earth by any such methods as Mr. Woods commends? Were these Luther's methods? Were they Calvin's? Were they the methods of John Knox? By such methods* did

* Still, however, there are truths so self-evident, or so immediately and palpably deduced from those that are, or are acknowledged for such, that they are at once intelligible to all men, who possess the common advantages of the social state; *although by sophistry, by evil habits, by the neglect, false persuasions, and*

Clarkson and his coadjutors abolish the slave trade in England; or their successors in the promotion of human happiness, slaveholding from the West Indies? To what else have the evils of intemperance ever yielded in this republic than to direct attacks? Only by *direct onset* has any thing been gained in this holy cause.

But perhaps Mr. Woods has some appropriate and impressive illustrations of the soundness, right and worth of his maxim, in the methods which religious teachers at the South have employed to free the republic and the church from the "particular"—yes, *very*, "PARTICULAR evil" of *slavery*. Age after age have they gone on employing, it would seem—we know not what *indirect* means—to correct those "depraved dispositions" in which this evil had its origin. A "*direct attack*" upon it, "*their better judgments*" have prevented them from making. They doubtless felt that the cause of "truth and virtue" could not spare such advocates; they have therefore been careful enough not "to awake the angry elements of the human breast, and then rush within their cruel and unsparing sweep." They felt, according to Mr. Woods' doctrine, that to become *martyrs in that cause, was to be lost* to it! But what good have all their efforts to correct the depraved dispositions of men-stealers around them done? Good! The evil which proceeded from these depraved dispositions, has every year been gathering strength. It has gone on unchecked, poisoning the life-blood, and palsying the powers of the church. Nay, these very teachers have, in great numbers, themselves become the active, hearty participants in the very crime which they were bound to expose and condemn! So much for the success of discreet exertions to remove a particular

impostures of an ANTI-CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD, JOINED IN ONE CONSPIRACY WITH THE VIOLENCE OF TYRANNICAL GOVERNORS, the understandings of men may become so darkened, and their conscience so lethargic, that there may arise a necessity for the republication of these truths, and this too with a voice of LOUD ALARM AND IMPASSIONED WARNING. Such were the doctrines proclaimed by the first Christians to the Pagan world—such were the lightnings flashed by Wickliffe, Huss, Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Latimer, &c., across the papal darkness; and such in our own times—the agitating truths, with which Thomas Clarkson and his excellent confederates—the Quakers—fought and conquered the LEGALIZED BANDITTI OF MEN-STEALERS, the numerous and powerful perpetrators of rapine, murder, and (OF BLACKER GUILT THAN EITHER) SLAVERY." COLBRIDGE'S Friend, p. 49, 50. We recommend this paragraph to the attention of the warm admirers of the great English philosopher and poet—especially in Vermont. The gentlemen Tracy can doubtless digest it.

evil, by correcting the dispositions in which it had its origin, without a direct attack upon the evil itself. "*The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.*"

There *was* a man, who for a time, ventured to act uprightly, and with decision and effect even at the infected South on the subject of slaveholding. A few sentences from Southey's life of Wesley will introduce him to our readers. "Wesley," Mr. S. informs us, "had borne an early testimony against the system of negro slavery. Dr. COKE feeling like Mr. Wesley, took up the subject with his usual ardor, preached upon it with great vehemence, and prepared a petition to Congress for the emancipation of the negroes. With this petition he* and ASBURY went to General Washington at Mount Vernon, and solicited him to sign it. Washington received them courteously and hospitably; he declined signing the petition, that being inconsistent with the rank he held; but he assured them THAT HE AGREED WITH THEM, and that if the assembly should take the petition into consideration, he would signify his sentiments by a letter. They proceeded so far themselves, that they required the members of the society to set their slaves free; and several persons were found who made this sacrifice from a sense of duty. One planter in Virginia emancipated twenty-two, who were, at that time, worth from thirty to forty pounds each. His name was *Kennon*, and deserves to be honorably recorded; but such instances were rare. And Dr. Coke, who had much of the national ardor in his character, proceeded in such an intolerant spirit of philanthropy, that he soon provoked a violent opposition, and incurred no small degree of personal danger. One of his sermons upon this topic incensed some of his hearers so much that they withdrew, for the purpose of waylaying him; and a LADY negro-owner promised them fifty pounds if they would give "*that little doctor*" AN HUNDRED LASHES. But the better part of the congregation protected him, and THAT

* Were not Coke and Asbury "FOREIGNERS"? Did they not venture to find fault with what the South now declares not even Northern Americans shall meddle with? And this soon after the "revolutionary" war? when the wounds inflicted in that contest were yet scarcely healed? Why did not *George Washington* rebuke them for their interference in what was none of their business? Let our windy tongue-valiant patriots, who are so forward with childish petulance, to denounce and insult George Thompson and Charles Stuart answer these inquiries.

SAME SERMON PRODUCED THE EMANCIPATION OF TWENTY-FOUR SLAVES. In one county the slave-owners presented a bill against him, which was found by the Grand Jury, and no less than *ninety* persons set out in pursuit of him, but he was got beyond their reach. A more ferocious enemy followed him with an intention of shooting him; this the man himself confessed, when sometime afterwards he became a member of the Methodist society. On his second visit to America, Coke was convinced that he acted indiscreetly, and *he consented to let the question of emancipation rest, rather than stir up an opposition which so GREATLY IMPEDED THE PROGRESS OF METHODISM.*" Vol. II. 203, 204.

On this interesting and instructive quotation, we cannot help remarking,

1. That those great lights of the Methodist society, *Wesley, Coke and Asbury*, were unanimous in their abhorrence of and opposition to the system of slaveholding. Wesley was a thunderbolt upon man-stealers.

2. *Washington "agreed with" these men* in their views of this subject, and encouraged them in their exertion, to promote the abolition of slavery.

3. The truth of God, plainly and pointedly announced by Dr. Coke, found its way with scorching influence, to the consciences and hearts of the petty tyrants, by whom he was surrounded. Some were enraged; others, set their bond-men free.

4. Coke was at length persuaded to abandon the ground of truth and rectitude, in his official efforts; *not by the violence of open infidels, but by the opposition of "false brethren."* The question of emancipation was put to rest lest the progress of Methodism should be impeded. *Thus Methodism lent its influence to rivet the fetter upon the heel of the slave!* It is our conviction that the American church is chiefly responsible for the atrocities and horrors of American slavery!

The trials Dr. Coke had to encounter in the stupid selfishness of his brethren, an extract or two from his journal, as quoted from Mr. Southey, will set in a clear and striking light. "At night I lodged in the house of Capt Dillard, a most hospitable man, and as kind to his negroes as if they were white servants. It was quite pleasing to see them so decently and comfortably clothed. And yet I could not beat

into the head (heart!) of that poor man, the evil of keeping them in slavery, although he had read Mr. Wesley's *Thoughts on Slavery* (I think he said) three times over. But his good wife is strongly on our side." "I preached the late Col. Bedford's funeral sermon, but I said nothing good of him, for he was a violent friend of slavery; *and his interest being great with the Methodists in these parts, he would have been a dreadful thorn in our sides, if THE LORD HAD NOT IN MERCY TAKEN HIM AWAY.*"

What if instead of abandoning the high ground, which in his integrity and benevolence he had taken, Dr. Coke had heartily and strenuously maintained it. What if the lady negro-owner and her numerous friends had seized him and sucked his blood. The progress of a spurious Methodism might have been impeded. But would his life, thus taken, have been lost to the cause of human rights? Of that cause, scores of earnest and determined advocates would have sprung up from his sacred ashes. And the more widely these ashes had been scattered on the winds, the more rich and glorious would have been the future harvest of martyrs.

Before we bring this article to a close, we would illustrate in a few particulars the practical bearings of the doctrines, which under the advocacy of such men as Mr. Woods, seem to have obtained a wide prevalence in the American churches. Let our readers understand, then, that in the *poetry of philanthropy*, they may "aim at that blissful state, in which nothing shall hurt or molest;" but in their "practical" concerns they are "patiently to endure" "a large class of evils and disorders," which, while endured, cannot but prevent the introduction of that state. In the *poetry of philanthropy*, they are to regard the "business of doing good" as "taking for the most part the shape of reform;" *in their practical concerns*, they are never to forget that "after sacrilege, there is nothing more profane than with rash and unbidden hands" to engage in the work of reformation. In the *poetry of philanthropy*, they are not to regard the work of reform, "as to be done at once, in rare emergencies, and then intermitted." "It needs," they must not forget, "to be as INCESSANT as the insidious encroachments of corruption;" in their *practical concerns*, they will find it the labor of a long life to determine whether they ought to lift a finger to remove any of the evils, by which

humanity may be oppressed. In the *poetry of philanthropy*, they may venture to declare, *in general*, that "the evils which man has suffered, and continues to suffer, from the abuse of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, ordained for his benefit, are immeasurably greater than those which have befallen him from any other source; and the call for their correction is, therefore, proportionably loud"; in *their practical concerns*, instead of a direct attack upon these evils, they are chiefly to busy themselves with correcting the *dispositions* from which they originated. In the *poetry of philanthropy*, they are to throw out the hint "to the enemies of seasonable and needful changes," "that the horrors of revolution are more to be charged upon them, than upon the immediate agents and victims"; in *their practical concerns*, they are to be extremely cautious how they wake the angry elements of the human breast, and expose themselves to their cruel and unsparing sweep.

But we have proceeded far enough. Our hearts sicken within us. *Pliable* himself would have been a fair candidate for distinguished honors in the religious world, where such doctrines as abound in the articles under review, prevail. *These doctrines contain the seeds of foul apostacy from the christian cause.* Their prevalence is the decline of every thing true, and good, and sacred in the church. Our warning voice, however feeble it may be, we cannot but raise. In the ears of every disciple of Jesus Christ, we cry, Beware! Admit the doctrines, which to a fearful extent prevail in the religious world—such doctrines as we have endeavored to expose in the paragraphs, to which we have now invited your attention—and your life-blood is poisoned at the fountain. You will be prepared to be any thing and to do any thing, which a selfish, thoughtless world may demand. To peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Spirit, and the smiles of Jesus Christ you must bid adieu! If you cherish the temper of Demas and of Judas, you ought to expect the retribution which give them their place among hypocrites and unbelievers.

From those who can read such articles as that, on which in this paper we have been dwelling, without disgust and indignation, the friends of human rights ought to know, that they have nothing of sympathy or assistance to expect. They might as well repair to a "broken cistern" for living

water. In standing up erect on the rock, which eternal recititude has furnished, they have committed in the eyes of the slave of expediency an unpardonable sin. He can forgive the wretches who fasten an iron grasp on the throats of their helpless, unoffending brethren; nay, he can offer ingenious apologies, and a stout vindication of their crimes. But the deep sympathy with the suffering and the dumb, which the friends of human rights may betray; their earnest and determined efforts in the spirit of the Gospel, and in accordance with their obligations as good citizens of the republic, to break every yoke, and set the oppressed free, he can never forgive. He can with a hearty good will misunderstand their motives, misinterpret their language, misrepresent their movements. And when he sees them subject to insult and outrage, to scorn and violence, he can look coolly on, with what he pleases to call a "manly composure." And if they were dragged to the stake, the most they could expect of him would be the expression of a regret which they did not feel, that they had imprudently thrown themselves away!

Let not those who plead the cause of the persecuted negro be deceived. Fiery trials let them calmly expect. If the burdens of their crushed brethren, whom they dare to recognize *as men*, are thrown upon their shoulders, let them not be surprised or shocked. He, who hates the negro, will never love his advocates. He who can sympathize with men-stealers, will never love their reprovers. He will consent to see them scourged with the lash, which is red with negro-blood. We may as well throw ourselves on the mercy of the negro-stealer of the South as the negro-hater of the North. What good can we expect from either? Be it ours to cut loose from all merely human dependencies. "Cursed is the man who trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm." Be it ours to confide in God. He is the patron of righteousness—the avenger of the oppressed. "Blessed is he, THAT CONSIDERETH THE POOR; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble." The Lord will preserve him and keep him alive; and he shall be blessed upon the earth: AND THOU WILT NOT DELIVER HIM UNTO THE WILL OF HIS ENEMIES."

THE HARMONY OF MOSES AND THE APOSTLES.

BY REV. SAMUEL CROTHERS,

Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Greenfield, Highland Co. Ohio.

THE charges of self-contradiction, and a corrupt system of morals have deservedly consigned many pretended revelations to everlasting contempt. A revelation from the God of truth, and infinite purity, must be pure and true. It is much to be lamented therefore, that Christians who acknowledge the slave trade and slavery to be inconsistent with the heavenly principles inculcated by our Lord and his apostles, should undertake to defend either of them by appealing to the law of Moses. Yet this is, and has been done, ever since the introduction of African slavery into the Christian church by *the man of sin*. Hence it is that the Old Testament has been falling into disrepute ever since the commencement of the slave trade, as is evident from the examination of the writings of divines before and after that event.

By a large majority of Christians of the present day, it is treated as an obsolete book. In many pious families it is seldom or never read. The exposition of it is rarely attended to in any of our pulpits, in most of them never. There are few theological seminaries, if any, where the careful study of it forms any part of the ordinary course of preparation for the gospel ministry. And among all the volumes under which our shelves are groaning, we never find a book professing to exhibit the gospel of the law of Moses. This is not surprising. No man is more consistent with his principles, than he who believes that the law given at Mount Sinai justifies the slave trade, or that system of slavery to which it gave birth, and for that reason has no wish that his children should be familiar with it. How could it be otherwise if he wished them at the close of life to look back and say with pious Job—"If I have withheld the poor from their desire, or have caused the eyes of the widow to fail. If I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless when I saw my help in the gate; then let my arm fall from my shoulder-blade, and mine arm be broken from the bone."

It would not mend the matter to tell our children that though Moses encouraged making property of human beings, Jesus Christ and his apostles were opposed to him in that particular, and therefore *they must not mind him*. What

would be the inference if they were capable of reflection, and possessed of common sense? That Moses was a bad man; that the apostles were not much better when they recommended his writing; that the Bible contradicts itself; that its divine Author is not particular about our morals; that the question whether it be right to commit sin, is a mere question of expediency, to be determined by the dispensation under which we live, or the circumstances in which we are placed; and that nothing is to be gained by being trammelled with the religion of the Bible. If the detail of such frightful inferences makes us shudder, what must the principle be from which they are legitimately drawn?

We shall endeavor to shew that THERE MUST BE A PERFECT HARMONY BETWEEN MOSES AND THE APOSTLES, IN FAITH AND HOLINESS, AND PARTICULARLY IN REGARD TO THE SIN OF SLAVEHOLDING.

The contrary supposition is infidelity, and absurd in itself. It is a species of infidelity, however, which is very prevalent. We often hear such questions as the following: "Why did God license the Jews to put away their wives and marry others when they pleased? Why did he legalize polygamy? Why did he encourage, among the Israelites, a thirst for war and shedding of blood? Why did David, and other good men, in their devotional exercises, breathe a revengeful spirit, and curse their personal enemies? Why did God direct his people to make slaves or involuntary servants of their brethren, and of the heathen around them?" Some infidels carry such questions about them as a sort of oiled daggers. Some professors of religion have them always at hand, to be used in case any of their favorite lusts should be attacked. And perhaps some are fond of them, for a reason not unlike that which induced many pagans to carry about with them, long lists of the crimes of their gods—their quarrels, and debaucheries, and thefts, and murders—to show that they were as good as the objects of their worship.

But, weak and uninformed christians often propose questions in the spirit of honest inquiry. Instead of shewing them, that they assume, as facts, gross slanders, invented, originally, for the defence of infidelity, and scandalous immoralities, the following is the spirit of the popular reply, and it is taken nearly verbatim from a respectable religious

periodical—"The law which God gave by Moses, at Mount Sinai, was intended for a dispensation which was dark and severe in its character. It, therefore, authorized some things which are very inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel, and blessed and peaceful dispensation under which it is our privilege to live." This is unvarnished infidelity, and its effect on the minds of the young and ignorant must always be deplorable.

The fact, however, is as unquestionable as it is distressing, that the advocates of slavery generally, and a few of the friends of emancipation, occupy common ground with infidels. They both assume that God and Moses are opposed to God and the apostles, as regards the universality and inalienability of the right to be free. The latter admit that slaveholding was licensed in the Old Testament, but contend that it is irreconcilable with the golden rule—*all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them*. The former profess greatly to admire that rule. They consider it a most happy improvement in the science of morals. But they insist that it was unknown to Moses when he made the law given at Mount Sinai.* If this be true, they ought both to be excluded from the communion of the church; the former not for holding slaves but for whining about conscience, and asserting their hatred of the principle; the latter for agreeing with them in charging the Almighty with self-contradiction. Far as it may be from their intentions, they do, in fact, unite in a conspiracy against the character of *the righteous Judge of all the earth*. They agree in charging him with licensing, in one part of his word, a certain practice as agreeable to the moral law, and therefore as christian; and with forbidding the same practice in another part of his word, as contrary to the same law, and therefore a soul-destroying sin.

Are those who mention the discrepancy of the Old and New Testament, as it regards purity of morals, aware that God is the author of all the scriptures? Do they know that the same Holy Spirit guided the pens of all the inspired writers? Do they recollect that it was by proving the charges of inconstancy and self-contradiction, that some of the worst impostors have been detected and convicted? In

* It will be well if some writer on Archeology does not give us a chapter of the interesting incidents when Moses was making the world.

what estimation is the man held who cannot tell a straight story? And what is the punishment for him who, in a court of justice, falsifies himself?

A minute examination into the writings of Moses and the apostles, is not necessary to satisfy one who believes them to be the word of God, that there can be no want of harmony in the principles which they inculcate. There can be no contrariety in the doctrines of the apostles to the will of God; for they assure us that they received them as a revelation from him. There can be no opposition to the divine will in the law of Moses, for the same reason: Moses received it from God, and gave it to Israel as a revelation from heaven. And where is the man who is bold enough in sin to assert, that with the change of dispensations, the moral character of the Most High has changed?

Perhaps some one who has been studying his Bible by devoutly reading Jahn on Archeology, is impatient to ask: What! do you not admit that principles are inculcated in the Old Testament which are at war with the pure and heavenly maxims of the New? We answer, God forbid? The same Holy One made both Testaments, and he made them both for the same purpose. And we here take occasion to say, that no one will ever understand the Scriptures while he sits at the feet of such infidel instructors as Jahn, and looks at the sacred pages through such a medium as his Archeology.

A brief analysis of the law of Moses will shew its harmony with the New Testament.

Just in proportion as it is carefully and successfully studied, all the principles are found to be pure and heavenly, calculated to promote the glory of God, and the present and eternal welfare of all men. The notion that it is a rough system, fit only for the government of a barbarous people, in the dark ages, is the offspring of sheer ignorance. We scarcely know how to apologize for the man who expresses or entertains such a sentiment, without supposing that he has yet to learn that God was its author. In that law Jehovah proclaimed His character to all the universe. Every statute which it contains was framed by infinite wisdom, and passed, with approbation, the scrutiny of His omniscient eye. He gave it to Israel as a transcript of His pure and holy will, as a law calculated to make them prosperous and happy as a nation ;

as a means of assimilating them individually to Himself, and of preparing them for the enjoyment of heaven. Holy men, guided in the study of it by the Holy Ghost, pronounced it *pure as silver tried in the furnace seven times*. In proportion as they grew ripe for heaven, their delight in the study of it, night and day, and their admiration of its wisdom and purity increased. The mind of man cannot conceive of a region more like heaven on earth, than the holy land would have been, had Israel, as obedient children, yielded themselves entirely to its influence. We have only to analyze it to perceive that it contains the same system of morals, the same gospel, and the same principles of jurisprudence, which are to be found in the New Testament.

It is usually divided into the moral, judicial, and ceremonial laws. This division is useful, though we do not know that it was understood or practised by the Jews. Nor do we believe it possible so to draw the line, as to arrange every thing under one or the other of these heads. Some of its statutes are partly moral, partly judicial, and partly ceremonial.

I. *The moral law.* By this we mean that law of supreme love to God, and love to our neighbor as ourselves, of which the ten commandments are specifications. As a plain intimation of the perpetuity of its obligation as a rule of morals, it was given to Israel, not written on perishable materials, like other parts of the Sinai covenant, but engraven by the finger of God on tables of stone.

1. *This law of love, is the perpetual and unchangeable rule of right and wrong.* The violation of it under any dispensation, in any circumstances, and from any motives, is sin. This was the law written on the heart of the first man in paradise. It was the test of right and wrong throughout the patriarchal age. It was given to Israel to regulate their hearts and lives during that dispensation. It was the law which the Saviour enjoined on all his followers till he shall come again. By this rule the works of both quick and dead will be tried in the last day. The transgression of it is the very thing which Moses and the apostles, and all inspired men mean by sin.

What then do those orators mean, who "turn with pleasure from the Old Testament, to the more pure morality of the New"? It seems charitable to suppose that they do not

mean any thing, and that in most cases it is a mere rhetorical flourish. Still it indicates a degree of utter ignorance or recklessness which is very offensive, and in a minister of the gospel, altogether inexcusable. If the morality of the Old Testament be not pure, neither is that of the New; for they are precisely the same.

It is true that the duties of an individual or community may vary with circumstances. The sum of the duties of a little child is, *honor thy father and mother*. In a few years his obligations to parents will, perhaps, cease; and those of a husband and father devolve upon him. But through every stage of life the transgression of the moral law is sin. The same principle is applicable to the whole human family. Man, in a state of innocence, was under the moral law. The transgression of it in paradise was sin. Yet his duties, before and after the fall, were different. It is equally true that a great change in the list of duties has resulted from the death of the Messiah. But to say that any change of dispensations, or circumstances, or motives, can affect the moral character of the unchangeable One, or the purity of his Law, or our obligations to observe it, is foolish and profane.

2. *The consideration by which the Almighty urges obedience to his law is, I am the Lord, &c., Exodus xx. 2.* The Scriptures furnish many and various motives to obedience; but the paramount consideration is, the Lord, the covenant God of his people requires it. Regard to his authority is what all the inspired writers mean by *godliness*, without which there is no acceptable worship or obedience. It is essential to every good work, that it be such as the law requires, and that it be done from regard to his authority. That vilest of maxims—*the end sanctifies the means*—sets aside the law of God as the rule, and regard to his authority as the motive, and substitutes in the room of both, the sinner's desire to do good. It is treason against the Most High—it is an attempt at dethronement; and there is no heresy condemned by the Scriptures in more fearful terms. Rom. iii. 8. The inspired apostle pronounces the man who adopts that principle, and attempts to propagate it as an inference from any thing in the Bible, a slanderer, and one who is bringing on himself a just damnation. Yet this very maxim is one of the main pillars of the slaveholding sys-

tem; and we never saw two pages in defence of that sin, in which it was not brought forward in some form or other, as though it were Bible theology.

3.. *Every moral precept in the New Testament accords with, and is expressed or implied in the moral law.* All those maxims in the discourses of the Saviour, and in the writings of his apostles, so much admired for their pure, and benevolent, and heavenly spirit, and so often quoted as proofs of the superior purity of the New Testament are found in the Old. They are all quotations from the tables containing the moral law, or the expositions of it by the prophets.

Take, as an example, what is called our Lord's golden rule, in his sermon on the Mount. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." We have rarely heard this quoted otherwise than as peculiar to the New Testament. Yet the Saviour gives it as a quotation from the Old—*this is the law and the prophets.* It is just the old commandment which every pious mother, in the Jewish church, taught her little children as soon as they were able to speak—*thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*

Take another example. We hear liberal praises of the Spirit inculcated towards enemies, in the same sermon. It is quoted as a most happy improvement in the morals of God's church, and never heard of till that sermon was preached. "But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is heaven, for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." It is a burning shame for a Christian, and especially a minister of the gospel to quote this as a sample of *the more pure morality*, especially if he play the infidel, by noticing it as an evidence of *the march of mind since the days of Moses.* Our Lord professedly gives it as the true exposition of the command, *love thy neighbor as thyself*, in opposition to that wretched gloss of the Pharisees, "thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy." He quotes it also as the test of a believer's likeness to his heavenly Father, and as

the test which had been in use among saved sinners, ever since there had been a church on earth.

Again, we hear high encomiums on the apostle Paul, for the spirit inculcated in his epistle to the church at Rome, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head." Rom. xii. 20. Yet this is just a quotation from the law of love, as expounded by Solomon, Prov. xxv. 21, 22. The truth is, if there be any deficiency in either of the Testaments in point of morality, it must be in the New. The apostles no where formally repeat the ten commandments. They never dreamed, and the Spirit by whom they wrote, never suggested such a thing as that the change of dispensations had set aside the moral law. That man is literally playing the fool, who defends, by appealing to the Old Testament, any practice which he acknowledges to be, in point of morality, inconsistent with the New. The morality which Moses and the apostles preached is one and the same.

4. *The moral law is the foundation of all our personal and inalienable rights.* In their zeal for slavery, some of our politicians and one clergyman in the South, have distinctly denied that the right to liberty is either universal, or inalienable. The latter pronounces this doctrine, in our Declaration of Independence, a mere rhetorical flourish; and asserts that no one is born free. Like Sampson, they would pull down the pillar of their own, and their country's freedom, rather than the Africans should enjoy the rights of men. It is alarming to hear our politicians openly proclaim themselves apostates from the first principles of American liberty. It is still more unpleasant to see divines turn infidels for the gain of slaveholding. But it is pleasant to see our enemies honestly hang out their colors.

In the moral law, our fathers found that doctrine, the glory of our nation—that THE RIGHT TO LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS IS UNIVERSAL AND INALIENABLE. There is no way of evading it but by turning infidels. It would not disprove our obligation to a knowledge of the moral law for the discovery of this great truth, could it be proved that the framers and signers of our Declaration of Independence were all infidels. An intelligent infidel is a man who having obtained a considerable stock of knowledge from the Bible, has set up for himself as independent,

and now spends his days in praising *the book of nature*, and scoffing at revelation. Our fathers pronounced this doctrine self-evident; and so it is to those, who free from blindness, imposed on their understanding by worldly lusts, look at it in the light of revelation. No pagan ever heard or thought of it.

But where, in the ten commandments, do we find that all men have an inalienable right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"? In the sixth command God forbids every creature in the universe to take the life of any creature whom He places under the moral law, until he forfeits it by crime. *Thou shalt not kill.* God has taken pains to protect every child of Adam in the enjoyment of his life. In the days of Noah, it was revealed as the standing law of the new world.—*Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man,* Gen. ix. 6. In the law of Moses it was enacted, that no place, however sacred, should be a refuge for the murderer. *Thou shalt take him from mine altar that he may die.* Ex. xxi. 14.

In the tenth and eighth commands, the right of every man to liberty or the ownership of his own body, and soul, is secured. These are the only commands in the decalogue which regulate us as to property. The one forbids us to fix a covetous eye on the person or property of another. The other forbids us to gratify such desires, by taking from him, without his consent, any thing that is his. *Thou shalt not steal.* That a man may forfeit his liberty as well as his life, by crime, is admitted. We have the proof, in the fact, that involuntary servitude was in one case ordained as a suitable punishment for a thief, and to deter the poor from stealing, Ex. xxiii. 3. But except in the case of forfeiture, he who seizes the person of a neighbor, and makes it his property is a thief, a thief of the worst kind—a *man stealer*. In the law given at Mount Sinai, to secure every man in the enjoyment of liberty, God annexed the most fearful penalty to the transgression of the eighth commandment, by making property of human beings. *He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death.* Ex. xxi. 16. The reason why he must die, while he who steals a sheep must only restore fourfold, is obvious. *In the image of God made he man.* He who makes mer-

chandise of man, makes merchandise of the image of his Maker. He who sells a christian, sells the grace of God, and trades in the members of the Saviour's mystical body. And the chief difference between his trading and that of Judas, is, he knows how to make a bargain, and asks a higher price for his merchandise. It is a truth which no good man can tell or hear, without pain ; but it must be told. In our churches, the Lord's table is often surrounded with private members, and ministers who have grown grey in a sin, for which, under the law of Moses, they would have been led out of the camp and stoned till they died. Slaveholders in the death struggle to escape the charge of men-stealing, sometimes tell us that *stealing* in the moral law, means exclusively, *taking with secresy* ; as if the Almighty had no controversy with pirates and robbers, and others who steal courageously. Sometimes they insist that the eighth commandment has no bearing on a neighbor's person, but simply on his property ; thus adopting a principle of interpretation which would acquit every man of murder, but him who kills his neighbor's cattle. Lately we have seen the moral law set aside altogether, and the principle of expediency or necessity substituted as the foundation of our personal rights.

The right of all men to the pursuit of happiness is evident from the fact that the chief end of their existence is to glorify God and enjoy him. This is happiness. But the slaveholding system interposes, and puts his power to obey God, and to seek his own good and the good of his neighbor, in the hands of another. If Israel filled up the cup of their iniquity by forbidding the apostles to preach to the Gentiles, (1 Thess. ii. 16.) how full must their cup be who deprive the Africans of the privilege of discharging their duties to God, and their fellow-men ; and kill their souls by making it penal to teach them to read the word of life, or to assemble them to hear the way of salvation. The whole history of persecution furnishes no parallel to that which, more than two millions of strangers are at this moment enduring in our "home of the free, and asylum of the oppressed."

That these rights are inalienable will hardly be denied by any reflecting man. No one can throw away his life, or the power which God has given him over his own body,

or his privilege to seek his own present and eternal happiness, without sinning against God. And he who tempts him to do it, is tempting to offend God, and wound his own soul.

II. *The judicial law*—including all those statutes, by which justice was to be administered. The laws of all nations are considered wise and salutary, just in proportion as they are enriched with those principles of equity, and justice, and mercy, which composed the judicial laws of Israel. No man is considered a qualified judge, or legislator, in any enlightened country, who is ignorant of them. They are daily quoted in our courts of justice, in our legislative halls, and by every respectable writer on jurisprudence.

Life, liberty, and property are unsafe in every country, excepting where the laws have been framed in the light of the law of Moses. Take even the testimony of those travelers who have made the tour of Europe, or the world, for the purpose (as they would have us believe) of making up their minds in regard to different religions, by an examination of their fruits. They will perhaps tell you they have discovered that popery, or paganism is the most amiable religion in the world—a discovery which they perhaps, determined to make before they left home. But if they be honest they will confess that they always set their feet with trembling in those dark regions where papists or pagans have put out the light of the Bible.

We glory in our happy form of government, our wise and equal laws,—except that one sixth of our population are doomed to slavery. We boast of the wisdom of our fathers; but how did they become so wise? Their fathers “beyond the flood” were enlightened in the Scriptures beyond all other nations, excepting that they had not yet discovered that a union of church and state has no foundation in the Jewish theocracy, or in the Old Testament, and is alike contrary to the interests of liberty and religion. Our fathers, from their first settlement in this hemisphere, enjoyed the ministrations of men who were mighty in the Scriptures, and so familiar with the Old Testament, that they usually came from *the study*, to worship in the family with their Hebrew Bibles under their arms. But for the law of Moses, which some would make a prop to the slaveholding system, and but for the labors of our Puritan fathers, inculcating and explaining it

to their children, we had this day been slaves. The notion that the judicial law contains any express or implied license to do any thing inconsistent with the requirements of the moral law speaks for itself.

1. *It is popery in its origin and spirit.* There can be no difficulty in tracking such a monster to its den. It is a twin sister of the famous doctrine of indulgences. By the one the pope filled his empty coffers ; by the other many a villain, besides the Jesuits, has made his fortune. Titrel improved indulgences, into licences to commit sin. The doctrine of sinning by license from the great man of Rome, is at this hour believed and practised by many. In our own country, under the light of the nineteenth century, they receive, with great joy, the news that the ship has brought a license to do that which would in their judgment be a damning sin without such license—to eat meat on Friday. From the notion that “God’s vicegerent” can license the violation of the moral law, the transition was easy to the principle that God can do the same thing and that he has done it, in the judicial law which he gave to his church by Moses. One of these abominations all Protestants denounce. The other is defended by some as sound theology, on account of its convenience in the defence of slaveholding and some other favorite sins.

2. *It is naked blasphemy, inasmuch as it is evidently at war with God’s moral character.* He reveals himself as a God who cannot look upon sin. For sin he has cast angels of heaven down to hell. For the transgression of his law, he has passed a sentence of condemnation upon all mankind. Who then has hardihood enough to say that he has himself licensed that for which he has damned angels and men.

3. *It is at war with the fact that God sent his Son into the world to die for sinners.* Were he a God who can look upon sin,—were the transgression of his law so light a matter, that he himself could license it, and look upon it with approbation, we never should have heard of so expensive an atonement as the death of his Son.

4. *It gives a frightful view of the office of a ruler in Israel.* If it was his business to compel men to transgress the moral law or protect men in doing it, his post was one which no good man could accept, and for which none but an incarnate devil could be qualified.

III. *The ceremonial law* or that part of the Sinai covenant which regulated the faith and worship of the Jewish church.

1. *It exhibited those truths on which saved sinners have been living ever since the fall of man.* The promise to our first parents in the garden of Eden, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, was the germ of all the gospel that has ever been revealed. The business of Moses, and all the prophets and apostles, was to bring sinners to that Saviour. The faith of a true worshiper in the times of the patriarchs, and under both dispensations is the same. Such truths as these are the prominent features of their creed. All mankind are sinners—without faith it is impossible to please God—without shedding of blood there is no remission—without holiness no man shall see the Lord. They have all had substantially the same views of themselves as guilty and vile, they worshipped the same God, trusted in the atonement and intercession of the same High Priest, were sanctified by the same Holy Spirit, through the instrumentality of the same word of truth. It does not alter the matter to say that the Jews believed in a Saviour to come; we in a Saviour who has *finished his work*. The same truths exhibited in diverse manners, and with different degrees of clearness, have sustained the hopes, and purified the hearts of all God's children since the world began.

2. *It exhibited the Gospel through the medium of types and symbols.* In that age, types and symbols, and parables and hieroglyphics were the common modes of instruction. Moses was learned in all the hieroglyphics of Egypt, and something like that method of instruction suited that infant state of the church, and the world. The ceremonial law is in a great measure a system of symbols or hieroglyphics. The mysteries of the spiritual world are represented by corresponding natural objects, and that which is comprehended by the intellect alone, is set before us in a sensible delineation. Almost every object which met the eye of a Jew in the holy land, conveyed to his mind some religious instruction. He saw those truths, which kept alive the love of God and man in his heart, written on the gate, and on the door post of every house he passed; and on the hands, and the frontlets, and on the borders of the garment of every

Jew he met. He was instructed in the great concerns of his soul, by the rules which regulated the raiment with which he clothed his body, and the food with which he nourished it. He was taught the truths of the Gospel, in the directions to be observed in his daily employment, in plowing and sowing his fields, in planting his olive yards and vineyards, in pruning, in gathering his harvest and vintage, and in thrashing, and in his daily intercourse with his fellow-men. In the temple service, in confessing their sins over the heads of victims, in slaying those victims by shedding their blood, in burning their bodies with fire, in sprinkling blood, in washing with water, and anointing with oil, they received the same instructions which were delivered verbally by those who expounded Moses and the prophets every Sabbath day.

Hence the apostles call the ordinances of the ceremonial law—shadows of good things to come—types or figures of the true—examples and shadows of heavenly things—parables of the time to come—a school-master to bring us to Christ—handwritings, which were contrary to us, and against us, i. e. notes of hand renewed every year, containing confession of sin, and drafts on Messiah. Hence when Messiah cancelled them with his blood, and nailed them to the cross, they were no longer to be used. To observe them now, would be as absurd as to celebrate the Lord's supper in heaven. Those good things being come of which they were pledges as well as symbols; the pledges are not to be retained. The apostles are speaking of those things not as they once were, but as they now are, stripped of divine authority, and without a single promise of God's blessing on the observance of them, when they call them "rudiments of the world, weak and beggarly elements."

We are aware that some learned men sneer at all attempts to find, in the ceremonial law, the gospel which Jesus Christ and his apostles preached. Many would have us believe that it had no definite meaning; or that it exhibited so little gospel that the church derived as little instruction from it as papists do from Latin prayers. It has been so long neglected, that to understand it requires much study and labor; and it sorts better with our vanity and love of ease, to maintain that it has no meaning, than to confess our ignorance. It must be admitted that a very disgusting

kind of preaching prevails in some departments of the church. Some ministers are in the habit of spiritualizing every text in the Bible, and of finding the gospel, where its author never intended it should be found. We have seen many a fine sermon standing like a sugar loaf, bottom upwards, on such texts as the question to Rebecca—"wilt thou go with this man,"—on her answer—"I will go." By this kind of preaching some men have acquired great popularity. This has grown out of the prevailing and criminal neglect of the study of the law of Moses. Were qualified men in the habit of expounding it, such preaching would soon become contemptible. It is a pity that such folly should divert the attention of the church from any part of God's revelation. A few years ago a sermon on faith and holiness was published, and the text was (Ex. xxxix. 26,) "a bell and a pomegranate." It might have been hoped that such foolery would not bias any reflecting mind. But the fact was otherwise. Soon afterwards a divine celebrated for his biblical knowledge was requested to undertake a commentary on the law of Moses for the purpose of exhibiting its gospel. He replied with a sneer that "he had not learning enough to find a system of faith and holiness in a bell and a pomegranate." He ought not to have been ignorant that the apostle Paul found in it all those precious truths which enrich his epistle to the Hebrews; and that it contains all the discoveries of truth and holiness which the church enjoyed during four thousand years. Jesus took it for his text when he showed his disciples, "That thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.

3. *This symbolical mode of instruction exhibited the truth in a peculiarly clear, sensible, and impressive manner.*—On this account it is partially retained in the church. The regenerating and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit are signified in baptism by the application of water. In the ordinance of the Lord's supper, bread and wine are used as emblems of the body and blood of the Redeemer. It is strange, therefore, that any one should imagine that Moses employed types for the purpose of obscuring the truth; or that the old dispensation was necessarily very dark, on account of the number of its symbolical institutions.

We find this mode of instruction employed, when it was necessary to present the truth with peculiar clearness and force. To warn the ten tribes soon after the revolt under Jeroboam, that the saviour typified by their rebel altar could not save them; a man of God was commanded to go to Bethel, and stand up at the moment of burning incense, and cry—"O altar, altar! thus saith the Lord, behold a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name, and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense unto thee." Three hundred years afterwards, Josiah did go all the way to Bethel, and did burn, on that altar dead men's bones, and the bones of the priests. Thus he proclaimed to all Israel, that God would kindle the fire of hell upon those who serve or trust in any other than the Saviour typified by the altar at Jerusalem. At the great prayer meeting held by Samuel and all Israel at Mizpeh, (1 Sam. vii. 6.) "they drew water, and poured it out before the Lord, and fasted on that day and said there, we have sinned against the Lord." That even the little children might understand that they were praying for the Holy Spirit without whose refreshing and sanctifying influences, no revival is worth any thing, they poured out water before the Lord. Thus it was proclaimed throughout that vast assembly, that putting away Baal and Ashtaroth would only be an outward change from gross idolatry to decent hypocrisy, unless God would grant his Spirit, "like rain upon the grass, and as showers that water the earth."

How a holy God can pardon the guilty, was symbolically exhibited in the temple services with a clearness which no language can exceed. He must have been under the influence of strong prejudice, who could go away uninstructed from an attentive view of the services on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi.) or any of those frequent occasions when a sin offering was made. Lev. iv. 4. The guilty man was to lay his hand on the victim's head, and confess his sins, and thus put them upon its head. Lev. xvi. 21. Its life was taken by shedding its blood; its body was burned without the camp; and its blood sprinkled on the altar. Thus he acknowledged that he had forfeited the life of his body and soul; and expressed his faith in that great sacrifice to be made when Christ should be made a sin offering for us, by taking our place, and bearing our sins, and the wrath of

God, the true fire of hell. (Hell or Gehenna—the antitypical land of Hinnom—because in that valley the bodies of sin offerings were burnt with fire, the emblem of the wrath of God.)

4. *The ceremonial law, by its numerous typical ordinances guarded the church against error.* Its use is thus stated, Gal. iii. 23, 24.—“Before faith came we were kept under the law shut up unto the faith,” &c. Timothy while stationed at Ephesus was cautioned (1 Tim. i. 4—12.) to beware of the abuse of the law of Moses by the Judaizers, on the one hand; and on the other, of the infidel sentiment that it is of no use to christians. “We know that the law is good if a man use it lawfully, knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient,” &c. It is surprising that by the law in this place, any one should understand the moral law. It is not true that it was not made for a righteous man. Our first parents were under it before they became sinners. He is opposing the notion that we are to seek salvation by our obedience to the law of Moses. He disproves it, by the fact that it contemplates the nation to whom it was given as sinners, and capable of such gross sins as murder, man-stealing, &c. Jesus Christ and the apostles use that law as containing an antidote for every poisonous principle which the destroyer of souls may invent. When the churches were agitated by disputes about justification, atonement, &c.; the matter was always settled by an appeal to the law of Moses, and the exposition of it by the prophets, and the book of Psalms. They settled such matters in no other way. It is doubtful whether any man has subtlety enough to contrive a heresy sufficiently plausible to disturb the peace of the church for an hour; which is not guarded against by that law. Hence the opposition to the study of it by the enemies of the doctrines of the cross. An enemy to the doctrine of Messiah’s vicarious sufferings, if he be not past feeling, trembles when he studies the import of the word atonement in the light of the temple service, and reads the doom of such professors as Cain, and Nadab, and Abihu. As long as there are enemies to this doctrine, and the doctrine of justification by the blood of Jesus, and sanctification by the work of his Spirit, there will be men to sneer at the religion of the Old Testament worshippers, their burnt offerings, their sprinklings

with blood, and their washings with water. We shall perhaps startle some of our readers when we say that the New Testament contains no gospel truth which is not contained in the ceremonial law. It gives us, with the light of the Old, more full and clear developements of many doctrines, but it contains nothing new.

5. *Jesus Christ preached no other gospel than that of the law of Moses.* Why do learned and pious men represent him as preaching a different gospel or system of morals from Moses, as though he was under a different dispensation? Who does not know that he lived under the Sinai covenant, that he scrupulously fulfilled the righteousness it required, and that it was not abrogated till he expired on the cross? Yet some respectable writers, when they come to a *hard place* in the law of Moses, such as that respecting divorce, endeavor to remove the difficulty by saying that Jesus Christ disapproved that ordinance and inculcated *a more pure morality*. All this in the face of the fact that the Son of God was the author of that law. And must we believe that when he commenced his ministry he found it so defective or impure that he was constrained to lift up his warning voice against it? There was no slander which he resented with more apparent vehemence than the insinuation that he was opposed to Moses and the prophets. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass, till all be fulfilled." Matt. v. 17, 18. And in the same connexion he teaches that the character and usefulness of every minister in the New Testament church should be estimated by his regard to the principles of that law, and his persuading others to regard it. Opposition to any thing inculcated by that law before it was abrogated was one of the iniquities to be punished by the judges. We know of no apology for those who charge the Saviour with it but ignorance. His enemies endeavored, incessantly, to allure or drive him into some act or expression which would look like that sin. Had they succeeded there would have been no necessity for the lying and false swearing to which they resorted in the hall of the high priest. But all their efforts were in vain. Not a word ever dropped from his lips which savored of disrespect toward the law of

their fathers. All his sermons and instructions were explications or more clear developments of the gospel and morals which Moses and the prophets preached. Their writings were his texts and his proofs. He always defended himself from the charge of innovation by appealing to Moses and urging them to search the Scriptures.

6. *The apostles preached no other than the gospel of the law of Moses.* Their hearers were sometimes startled by something which appeared new; but were always quieted by an appeal to the law and the prophets, and the book of Psalms. It was, in fact, the harmony of their gospel with the Old Testament which commended their preaching to those Jews who believed. It is recorded in commendation of the Bereans, that when they heard the apostles they "searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so." And when they saw that the gospel they had heard was the same which had led the fathers to heaven, they received it with all readiness of mind.

7. *No man can understand the history of the Saviour, particularly his last sufferings and death, without the light of the ceremonial law.* The evangelists adhere scrupulously to facts, excepting when they occasionally point out some fulfillment of prophecy; they appear purposely to avoid comment or explanation. It is surprising that those who deny a vicarious atonement, and contend that Jesus died merely to set us an example of heroic virtue, are not ashamed to speak of his death in the presence of those who are familiar with the history of the martyrs. If he endured nothing but the pains of crucifixion, the history of many of his followers furnishes better examples of patience and fortitude. Sickly, timid, and feeble women have received sentence of death by torture, without any emotions which betrayed either fear or unwillingness to die. They have spent the night preceding their execution in prayer, and singing psalms and in cheerful conversation with their friends. They have marched to the cross or the stake with an unhesitating step, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer for their Saviour's sake. When Peter received sentence to die, by crucifixion, we are told that his only regret was his unworthiness to die in the same manner in which his Saviour died; and he entreated them to crucify him with his head downwards. But when the hour of our Sa-

viour's sufferings drew nigh, he was exceedingly *troubled in spirit*. At one time the fear, and amazement, and anguish of his spirit was such that he seemed like one at his wit's end: "And his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling to the ground." We see him retiring and praying that if it were possible the cup might pass from him; then returning and complaining that his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. We see him again withdrawing and praying the same prayer; and again returning, and complaining to the disciples of their insensibility, and pleading with them to watch and pray. An angel from heaven had to be sent to strengthen him. It seemed to require an effort to consent to go through the dreadful work. It seemed to be necessary to call into operation all his love of his Father, and all his pity for the souls of men, to be able to say, "Nevertheless not my will, but thine be done." It is remarkable that it was when none of his enemies were nigh him, and when no earthly instrument of torture was applied, that his sufferings seemed to be most intense. Though the high priest with the rabble in his hall, and Herod with his men of war, and Pontius Pilate with the Roman soldiery, could not, with all their ingenuity in torturing, wring from his lips a single murmur, he cried out under the intolerable pressure of his Father's hand. It seemed as if his Father was his chief tormentor. The evangelists give no explanation. It seems to have been their business to give us facts without note or comment. The Author of the Bible never intended that the church should understand her Saviour's history without the light of the ceremonial law. But all is made plain when we see the man for whom an atonement was to be made, standing with his hand on the victim's head, confessing his sins. When we see the priest taking its life by shedding its blood, and burning its body with fire without the camp. Thus was prefigured the sacrifice of Messiah—that he should take the sinner's place—that his life should be given a ransom for ours—that the Holy Spirit should pour in upon his soul the wrath of the sin avenging God. The fire used in burning the sacrifice was the symbol of the presence and agency of the Spirit in the work of justice to the guilty. No wonder that while martyrs have died rejoicing, the martyr's Saviour died complaining. Believing martyrs were cheered by the light of

their Saviour's countenance, and supported by his grace. But when the Saviour suffered, God withdrew the light of his countenance—*It pleased the Lord to bruise him*—the pains of hell got hold upon—all the billows of his wrath passed over him.

8. *The New Testament without the Old is a very imperfect rule of faith and practice.* Taken singly it is more imperfect than the Old, excepting that it points out Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah already come. This is startling to those who are in the habit of viewing those regions as supplied with the light of revelation, which are furnished with the New Testament. The writers of the New Testament almost wholly omit many important subjects in practical theology, because God has clearly revealed his will on these subjects in Moses and the prophets, and the book of Psalms. Take as an example the subject of national sins. They no where take up and discuss the question: What is national sin? The truth on this subject is clearly exhibited in the law of Moses, and in the historical parts of the Old Testament. Take as another example the subject of slavery. When there was no such thing in the church, when the Israelites themselves were escaping from the house of bondage, God proclaimed it as the standing law among his people, that the man-stealer should be put to death. Hence, the apostles never discuss the question of slavery. They treat that sin as many others on which God had clearly revealed his will, which are plainly contrary to the moral law, about which there was no diversity of sentiment among christians, and which had no place in the church even for an hour. When the apostle Paul, however, has occasion to mention the man-stealer or enslaver, (andrapodistes) he classes him with the very worst of men.

The apostles give us no set discourses on subjects in theology, excepting when the circumstances of the churches made it necessary. The doctrines of the cross are seen in all their discourses and writings. They are the arguments to deprecate from sin, to urge sinners to flee to the Saviour, and to stimulate christians to good works. It is a matter of universal experience, and expressly taught in the Bible, that nothing but the proper exhibition of the cross of Christ ever did or ever will make men zealous and careful to maintain good works, Titus iii. 8. Those who oppose what is pro-

perly called *doctrinal preaching*, neither understand what they say, nor whereof they affirm. But the apostles generally introduce the doctrines of the cross as subjects on which God had already given his church a clear revelation. They never formally discuss them, except when it became necessary to quiet the churches, by settling some agitating dispute, or repel some furious assault of the adversary. To the propagation of heretical views on the subject of justification, we are indebted as the occasion of the epistles to the Romans and Galatians. And it is worthy of particular remark, that the apostle establishes the doctrine of justification through the imputed righteousness of the Redeemer, received by faith, by appealing to the Old Testament. He shows how Abraham was justified, how David obtained forgiveness, and how all saved sinners, before the coming of Christ, obtained forgiveness and acceptance before God. The violence with which the unbelieving Jews assailed the atonement and priesthood of our Lord, made it necessary for the apostle Paul to write the epistle to the Hebrews. There is not a theological idea in that epistle which is not professedly drawn from the Old Testament, and principally from the ceremonial law. His professed object is to enable all churches and christians to look at the atonement and intercession of their great High Priest in the light of the temple service. That precious epistle, as well as the New Testament generally, must, in a great measure, be a sealed book to those who are strangers to the law of Moses.

9. *No man can understand the writings of the apostles without the law of Moses.* The opinion prevails to a considerable extent that the evangelists and apostles are so full and clear on all the doctrines of the cross, that the Old Testament is useless, excepting that it is still venerable for its antiquity. It is admitted that many professors who have no friendship for the latter, have attained to a considerable acquaintance with the doctrines of revelation. But, be it remembered, they once studied Moses and the prophets, or they have taken their theology second handed from those who did.

10. *No man can explain the terms by which the offices and blessings of Messiah are expressed in the New Testament, without the light of the law of Moses.* Let any remove that light and then tell us what the apostles mean

when they speak of Jesus as our master—the Messiah—our advocate—our high priest—the Mediator—our Redeemer—our prophet, priest, or king? What do they mean when they call him our passover—the propitiation—the lamb of God? What do they mean by the terms redemption—atonement—reconciliation—justification—sanctification—adoption, &c. &c.? The apostles never explain them. They use them as terms with which the church had been familiar from the beginning. The scriptures with which they had been conversant, were Moses and the prophets, and the book of Psalms; their terms and phraseology are derived from them.

The notion that classical pagan writers are to fix the meaning of the terms of the New Testament is absurd. They can assist us in understanding things known only among pagans; but they cannot explain things which they did not understand themselves. The direct tendency of such a principle of interpretation is to paganize theology; and we cannot see why it should be advocated by those who are not hostile to the truth as it is in Jesus. There is truth in saying that the first preachers to the Gentiles must have found great difficulty in explaining the offices and blessings of the Saviour without using pagan terms, or without using the terms of the church in the pagan sense. But we are sure they never preached paganism for the sake of being easily understood. And the fact is, they used the language of the church, which was that of the Old Testament, and they used it in the sense in which it had always been understood by the family of God.

It is equally preposterous to say that the laws and customs of the Roman empire, or any heathen nation, are to explain the terms of the New Testament. Yet, in the death struggle for their lusts, this is strenuously pleaded for by many. We have only to apply it to expose its absurdity. The apostles often recognize husbands, fathers, and masters as christians and members of the church. When these relations are explained by the Roman law, a husband can sell his wife, a father can sell or put his child to death, a master can make merchandise of his servants. The inference would be, the apostles admitted, and retained in their communion those who sold their wives, those who murdered

their children, and those who made goods and chattels of their fellow men. The last item in this inference is advocated by many professed christians of our day as sound theology. Perhaps the time will come when they will adopt the others, merely for the sake of consistency.

But God has so made the Bible that it interprets itself. We repeat it, the terms of the New Testament are taken from the Old, and principally from the law of Moses. Hence, the confessions of faith of all Protestant churches, more or less clearly acknowledged the following, as a fundamental principle in the exposition of the Scriptures:—"The infallible rule of interpretation of scripture, is the scripture itself; and, therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of Scripture (which is not manifold but one) it must be searched and known by other places that speak more plainly." This is the rule of interpretation urged upon their hearers by our Lord and his apostles. This, that *demonstration of the Spirit*--that preaching *not with the enticing words of man's wisdom*--which characterized the ministrations of the apostles.

The moment students of theology abandon the study of Moses and the prophets for systems of second handed systematic, and polemic theology, the race of men *mighty in the Scriptures* will become extinct. If there was a man in apostolic times, who stood pre-eminent among those who were full of the Holy Ghost, and mighty in the work of convincing Jews and Gentiles, it was he who was distinguished for his knowledge of the law of Moses. The superior qualifications of Timothy as a good minister, nourished up in the words of faith and good doctrine are ascribed, under God, to the privilege he had enjoyed from his infancy, of being taught by a pious mother and grand-mother, to understand the Old Testament. It was the adoption of a very different plan of training young men for the ministry which has hoisted the flood-gates of error, and deluged, with heresy, some of the fairest portions of Christendom. A disposition to give pagan writers, and the laws and customs of heathen nations, the place of the prophets, and the law and customs of the Old Testament church, is one of the worst signs of our times. There would be nothing in the errors which now interrupt the peace of the church, calculated to make

us despair, if the friends of truth would cling to the proper principle of Scripture interpretation. But unless this be done, the banishment of all the errors which may now be found in the church, would not materially better her condition thirty years hence.

The notion that the ceremonial law was calculated to make believers less pure than the moral law required, or more so than was consistent with the judicial law, cannot be entertained for a moment by any sound mind. If, then, it be true in mathematics, that things which are equal to the same are equal to one another, it must be equally true, that while Moses and the apostles are in harmony with the moral law, they harmonize with each other.

PRO-SLAVERY TESTIMONY EXAMINED.

BY THE EDITOR.

It is the universal complaint of slaveholders that abolitionists misrepresent the condition of the slaves. To such a complaint we hope this article will not be liable. Another in the present number might also escape the common censure, were not many people so wonderfully charitable as to believe, that in all slaveholding communities the general *practice* must be better than the *laws*. But to establish all the positions of the immediate abolitionists in regard to the actual condition of the slaves, we are contented to rely on the testimony of the *defenders of slavery themselves*. At present, we shall enter upon an examination of this testimony, and we beg the reader to remember, that we quote nothing from mere apologists, but from practical and determined pro-slavery writers—slaveholders themselves.

The authority of the master over the slave is *absolute*; the restraints of the law over the master, to say nothing of the disposition of the power which administers the law, being nominal or necessarily imperfect. We call attention to this point because it must be settled and understood before we can duly appreciate the testimony in regard to the actual treatment of the slaves. In a "Refutation of the Calumnies

circulated against the Southern and Western States." "By a South Carolinian,"* understood to be the late Edwin C. Holland, Esq., we find the following statement:

"It is true, indeed, that all slaveholders have laid down non-resistance and the most perfect and uniform obedience to their orders, as fundamental principles in the government of their slaves. This necessarily results from the relation in which they stand, and we might as well denounce that government a despotism, that punishes any infringement of its laws, as to call that a tyranny which is nothing more or less than an authority *unavoidably* from the very character of the connexion between master and slave."—p. 47.

Mark how "*non-resistance*," "perfect obedience," are *necessary* to the relation!

The Hon. Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, in his late "Essay on the Management of Slaves," says:

"Every plantation represents a little community differing from its chief in color, habits and general character. The members of this community are his lawful property. Over them he exercises executive, legislative, and judicial powers. The right of the master to his slave is not, however, absolute. The relation between them is limited and restrained by the laws of the State, to a few of which I will advert.

"1. The felonious killing of a slave by a white person is murder.

"2. If a slave suffer in life, limb or member, where no white person is present, the owner or other person having the care or management of such slave, is adjudged guilty of such offence, unless he can make the contrary appear by good and sufficient evidence, or shall *by his own oath* clear and exculpate himself.

"3. No master can emancipate his slaves.

"4. He is obliged, under the penalty of a fine for each and every offence, to allow them sufficient clothing and food.

"5. He cannot compel them to labor more than *fourteen* hours in the twenty-four."—p. 4.

Observe the nature of this authority. The "chief" who is bound to his subjects by no community of "color, habits or general character," has the right to buy and sell them at his pleasure, as any other *property*. The *life* of the slave which the law professes to protect, is made to depend on the *complexion* of the witnesses, and he has no security against the anger of his master, unless we suppose that he who has committed *murder* will fear to commit *perjury*. The law, in refusing to permit emancipation, certainly does not restrain the authority of the master, nor does it give any effectual redress to the slave who may be underfed or overworked, so long as it leaves him to the judgment of slaveholding magistrates. These magistrates will ask, not what food and clothing are sufficient for a *man*, but what are sufficient for

* Published in Charleston, 1822.

a *slave*. They will be guided by their own practice, or that of their neighbors. So it may happen in spite of the law, that the mass of the slaves are left half starved and half naked. And as to labor, slave-driving must indeed be a very ineffectual mode of obtaining it, if it cannot overwork a human being in fewer hours than *fourteen*! What stronger proof of overworking could be demanded than the mention of *such* a law among the *restraints* of the master. From this testimony it must appear to the satisfaction of every reasonable man that the protection of the law is an infinitesimal, a mere nullity, and may safely be thrown out of the account. The condition of the slave is, therefore, left to the passions and interests of the master.

The author of "A Refutation of Calumnies," &c., has brought forward the testimony of a number of the largest planters of the low country of South Carolina, and that on which he evidently relies with the most satisfaction is from Robert J. Turnbull, Esq., which he says "is as full and as conclusive as the most bigoted sceptic could desire."

Mr. Turnbull commences by stating that the condition of the slaves within the last thirty years has been considerably ameliorated by the introduction of mills and machinery, the change in the culture of rice, the substitution of cotton for indigo, and the greater indulgence of the masters. By a labored argument he attempts to show, that "few laborers in any part of the world work easier and have more comforts, and are, upon the whole, more contented" than the slaves of South Carolina. Let us look at his facts. It does not necessarily follow that the introduction of machinery, even if it have abridged by half the aggregate labor of cultivation, has at all diminished the toil of the slave. The master, like the owner of capital, has it in his power to reap the whole advantage of such improvement. No country has saved more labor by machinery than England, and yet Southey, in a paragraph quoted by our pamphleteer to show the comparative wretchedness of her operatives, caps the climax of their miseries by calling them "SLAVES." Says Mr. Turnbull: "With cotton there is no cutting, or carrying, or heavy harvesting. The pods ripening in succession, and continuing four or five months, make the harvest slow and tedious, but the work is *light and easy*, so much so, that all the pregnant women even, on the plantation, and weak and

sickly negroes incapable of other labor, and all the boys and girls above nine and ten years of age, are then in requisition to assist in gathering the wool that hangs from the pods."

"It is in this season of cotton picking alone, that the slave labors (*if it can be called labor*) from sunrise to sunset." In this business there are no *tasks*, but in all others, according to Mr. Turnbull, they are tasked so that "upon all well regulated plantations the average time of laboring does not exceed *seven or eight hours* in the twenty-four." It is fortunate for all practical men who would get at the truth on this subject, that Mr. Turnbull has furnished a schedule of the tasks which he says are so firmly fixed that no owner can exceed them, without subjecting himself "to the reproach of his neighbors, and to such discontent among his slaves as to make them of but little use to him."

THE DAILY TASKS ARE THESE:

"Cutting firewood,	-	-	-	-	-	one cord.
Splitting rails,	-	-	-	-	-	one hundred.
Listing ground,*	-	-	-	-	-	{ a quarter of an acre; or 105 feet square, in- to 21 beds 5 ft. apart.
Breaking or bedding,	-	-	-	-	-	
Hoeing of cotton or corn,	-	-	-	-	-	do. do.
Ginning of cotton,	-	-	-	-	-	half an acre.
Moating ot do.	-	-	-	-	-	25 lbs. clean.
Ditching in light land,	-	-	-	-	-	50 lbs. clean.
do. in clay do.	-	-	-	-	-	420 cubic feet.
Gathering blades,	-	-	-	-	-	210 do. do.
Breaking in corn ready for carting,	-	-	-	-	-	half an acre.
Digging potatoes,	-	-	-	-	-	do. do.
						do. do.

We think we have a good right, with such testimony, to save ourselves the trouble of any further inquiry whether men who regularly perform such tasks, in *seven or eight* hours, for the sake of gaining time for their own patches, are capable of *taking care of themselves*. We pronounce them a most efficient and industrious people, altogether fit, at this moment, to be put in possession of the ownership of their own bodies.

The subsistence which is doled out weekly to these efficient laborers, and which the masters would have us be-

* Taking off the sward with a hoe, and drawing it together as a foundation for a bed for the plant.

lieve is better than the slave could procure with fair wages, is thus spoken of :

“The subsistence of the slaves consists from March until August of corn, ground into grists or meal, which made into what is called *hominy*, or baked into corn bread, furnishes a most substantial and wholesome food. The other six months they are fed upon the sweet potatoe, which is boiled, baked or roasted, as their taste or fancy may direct. These articles are distributed in weekly allowances, and in sufficient quantity, together with a proper allowance of salt. The skim milk or clabber of the dairy is divided daily. It would be very desirable if regular rations of bacon or some other animal food could be furnished them ; but as this cannot always be practicable, it is difficult to make it a matter of permanent regulation. Meat, therefore, when given, is only by way of indulgence or favor.”

To atone for this economical regimen, which we suppose Mr. Turnbull himself would hardly say was ordered with a more tender regard for the stomach of the slave than for the pocket of the planter, we are told that the slaves thus fare better than the Scotch on their *oatmeal*, or, than the Irish on their *potatoes* ; and above all, that those who live on the creeks and rivers *may* catch as many fish, oysters, and crabs as they please ! The clothing of the slaves is regulated with the same admirable simplicity. It “consists of a winter and a summer suit ; the former, a jacket, waistcoat, and overalls of Welsh plains, and the latter of Osnaburg or homespun, or other substitutes. They have shoes, hats, and handkerchiefs, and other little articles, such as tobacco, pipes, and rum, &c. Their dwellings consist of *good clay cabins* with clay chimneys,” &c.

We are also informed that on most plantations there are hospitals for the sick. And what is worthy of remark, these hospitals have another important use. “When the patient is *really* sick every comfort and attention may be dispensed by such an institution ; whilst to such as enter it only to skulk from labor (which is peculiar to some negroes,) it becomes a *penitentiary*.”

Mr. Turnbull mentions the patches of ground that are allotted to each slave, and infers from their cheerfulness and mirth that they are better off than the poor of most countries. But notwithstanding their merriment, he thinks them less contented than they were thirty or forty years ago, owing to the *relaxation* of *discipline* which has been “almost carried *too far*.”

This sad deterioration of discipline, upon which the defender of slavery here unfortunately stumbles, brings him at once to a most important revelation. He boldly announces, that "THE ONLY PRINCIPLE UPON WHICH ANY AUTHORITY OVER THEM [THE SLAVES] CAN BE MAINTAINED IS FEAR; and he who denies this has little knowledge of them." It must not be forgotten that Mr. Turnbull is a *practical* man, who speaks of that which he knows. If there had been in his neighborhood or within his acquaintance any case in which authority was maintained, otherwise than by an appeal to the basest passion, it could not have escaped his mention. But he knows of no other mode of governing slaves than by appealing to their *fear*. He says, expressly, "the regulations that would be applicable to whites, entirely fail when applied to the government of slaves." The master rules by an undisguised REIGN OF TERROR. Are we to be told, after such an admission from one of the largest and most benevolent slaveholders of South Carolina, that the actual infliction of the *whip* or the *stocks* is unfrequent. Is it to be supposed that in a gang of one hundred slaves—old and young—none will neglect their tasks, or take liberties with the property of their master? It would be a miracle for such a number of people to obey, to the utmost, the will of the master for a single day. Some transgression must take place. Nothing short of an absolute certainty of terrible punishment could prevent it. But such a certainty could not exist. And if any transgression, however small, comes to the knowledge of the master or his agent, it must be punished, otherwise the grand motive, *fear*, is impaired. We have the testimony of a perfectly competent witness that a plantation can be cultivated with *slaves*, by no other motive than *fear*, and we know that this motive cannot be kept in existence except by punishments, which must be either very *frequent* or very *severe*. Let any man estimate the amount of collateral motives, which, together with his wages, impel the free laborer to industry—his character and happiness in this life and the next—and then say what frequency or weight of punishment it must take to produce *fear* enough to replace all these. It will not do to say the slave is attached to his master, and labors with a desire to please him. It will not do to say that he is filled with a sort of patriotism or loyalty,

which makes his master's wealth and prosperity his own. All this is flatly contradicted by the witness on the stand, who distinctly asserts, that "the *only* principle upon which any authority over them can be maintained is FEAR; and he who denies this has little knowledge of them." He who can deny, in the light of this testimony, the common and severe use of corporal punishment to secure the labor of slaves, or, in other words, that they are driven with the lash, can assert an effect and deny the cause. He affirms that the slaves are governed by the fear of what is never inflicted.

We put it to the common sense of the reader whether the admission of this writer must not neutralize all his eulogies.

The next witness we shall produce is Rev. THOMAS S. CLAY, of Georgia. In his "*Detail of a plan for the moral improvement of negroes on plantations, read before the Georgia Presbytery; printed at the request of the Presbytery, 1833,*" we find much valuable information. The more valuable inasmuch as it is not his design to speak of the condition of the slaves, and he alludes to it only incidentally, as a matter of perfect notoriety to the Presbytery. His business is to propose a remedy, but from the nature of this remedy we most clearly learn some things in regard to the disease. In relation to the supply of food furnished by the master, Mr. Clay says:—

"From various causes, this is *often not adequate to the support of a laboring man*. The quantity allowed by custom, is a *peck of corn per week*, and if it be sound flint corn, this is sufficient to sustain health and strength under moderate labor. But there is *often* a defect here, the quantity is then *insufficient*; and who should be astonished, if the negro takes from the field or corn house, the supply necessary for his craving appetite, and then justifies his act, and denies that it is stealing? It is a common statement made by intelligent negroes, that without the aid of their own gardens, poultry-house, and cornfields, their allowance would not hold out. Should the quality of corn be poor, let them have their food by weight, giving not less than 14 pounds per week of corn. The allowance should on no occasion be given on the Sabbath; besides being a violation of God's law it interferes with attending at church. It should be given on stated days; the same day every week. Time should be allowed the negroes for receiving their provisions, *neither should they be delayed after a hard day's work until late at night.*"

Who is so dull as not to receive information as to the actual condition of the slaves from this grave and solemn instruction? Remember that it falls from the pen of a *practical slaveholder*, who is advocating a certain system of *oral* religious instruction, but is most cautious to avoid all that

looks like abolition. Could he hope his cause to prosper if he slandered his neighbors? Is it not a fundamental part of his policy to smooth over the evils of slavery?

In regard to CLOTHING he says:

"The winter clothes should be given in November, and those for summer in April or May. *This is often neglected*, and consequently the impotent, (of whom the number is very great) *suffer much*; and however well a negro may endure the cold when at work, or sitting by his fire side, the want of warm clothing would be a good reason for not attending church."

In regard to the DWELLINGS he says: "Too many individuals are crowded into one house and the proper separation of apartments cannot be observed." He recommends "such an arrangement, by means of partitions, as to furnish separate apartments for the larger boys and girls." Truly such arrangements are quite important to the decencies of civilized life, quite important to the purity of christian morals, but will they ever be regarded as of much importance to the well being of *human cattle*? Can the masters afford these expensive arrangements, the consequence of which will be to ruin their *property* by converting it into refined, self-respecting men and women?

In regard to the treatment of the sick, says Mr. Clay, "As in a sparse population the residence of the physician must be remote from many of the settlements, it is advisable that every plantation should be supplied with the medicines in ordinary use. This is too frequently neglected, many plantations are even destitute of salts, the cheapest and simplest of all medicines."

In regard to the "regulation of work," Mr. Clay says: "Great judgment and experience are necessary, to guard against the evil of *overtasking* on the one hand, and requiring too little labor on the other. When negroes are *overworked*, their seasons of relaxation are often marked by extreme licentiousness, drunkenness and debauchery; the mind swings from violent pressure into boundless indulgence." Are we to infer from this that slaves are *seldom* overworked? How could a man draw such a picture of the effects of *overworking* if the original had not been often before him?

[The printer admonishes us that these remarks must be suspended for the present. On a future occasion the subject will be resumed.]

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

THE BRITISH WEST INDIES. In Antigua 30,000 slaves were made unconditionally free on the first of August, 1834. On the fourth of August, 1835, the *Weekly Register*, of that island, a press not predisposed to approve the change, speaks thus—"In the course of the lapsed year of freedom, there has been an unquestionable improvement in the habits of the people. The wandering spirit has evaporated:—they have discovered that there has been much less leisure or spare time in domestic service than in agriculture—less certainty in desultory employments such as fishing, portering and boating, &c., and the comforts of 'home,' begin to be duly appreciated. The employing and superintending class, too, have gradually acquired the art of governing those as freemen, whom they once commanded as bondsmen, and the practice of task-work which is becoming almost universal has given the threefold advantage of stimulus to exertion, despatch of important work, and leisure to the laborer for domestic and other employment. This now extends, we understand, even to wedding; and with the increasing use of the plough and other machinery, which save a great deal of the severer tillage so distasteful in the culture of the sugar cane, we may hope for a prospering colony."

In Jamaica, where the apprenticeship system was introduced, there was a manifest determination on the part of the planters that it should not succeed. They commenced by deceiving, worrying and abusing the apprentices. They not only predicted insurrection, but by a most illegal use of their old authority did all in their power to excite it. The apprentices, however, as soon as they had learned what were their legal rights, were careful "to go by the law." They were so provokingly quiet, patient, peaceful and industrious in the hours of legal labor, that they seem at last to have gained a complete victory over their oppressors.

The planters predicted that the apprentices would not work for wages in their own time, and, as the time legally allowed to the master was insufficient, that the crop could not be gathered. A committee of the Jamaica House of Assembly went through a mock examination of evidence on the subject, and on the 13th of November, 1834, reported the plan a complete *failure*. They state, "that the new system is not succeeding; that forty and a half hours of labor in the week are inadequate to enable the cultivation of the country to be continued; that the negroes are performing no fair proportion of work, even during that limited number of hours, and that during their own time very few of them will work for such rate of wages as sugar cultivation can afford to pay; that idleness and contempt of authority are daily becoming more apparent and alarming; that the pimento crop the only article which has come to maturity since the first of August, has been to a great extent lost to the proprietors, from the impossibility of getting it gathered in; that the coffee crop now commencing is likely to share a similar fate, and that the prospect to the proprietors of sugar estates is still more desperate, in the certainty that their canes must rot upon the ground, from the absolute impossibility of manufacturing the juice into sugar during the limited number of hours which the factories can be kept in operation."

This report was designed to defeat the abolition act, by driving the British government to restore the old authority, under the name of a local magistracy, whose

business it should be, not only to "preserve order and repress crime," but to "enforce industry" in the apprentices' own time—to force them to work for wages: This well concerted scheme, however, met with small success. The government proceeded to increase the special magistracy, and to afford to the planters full security for all that labor to which they were by law entitled. The sugar crop came on, and the planters were brought to see that the game they were playing upon the poor apprentices, if continued, would only result in their own destruction. Self-interest dictated a change, and the planters were now fain to make a *bona fide* offer of pay for extra labor. Their tune came down from '*you shall work without wages,*' to '*will you work for 2s 6d. per day?*' The alacrity with which the apprentices came forward at the clink of the shillings was overwhelming. They were no sooner convinced that the money would be theirs, than they offered more work than the planters were willing to pay for, at a great reduction from the first offer. We are informed by subsequent letters that on some estates they are working in their own time at 1d. per hour! In the British "Companion to the Newspaper," published by the "Society for the diffusion of political knowledge," are ample quotations from letters written from Jamaica, during the progress of the sugar crop. Says one of the writers, whom we take to be a special magistrate, "Now that they see the wages paid, their apparent indifference has been every where thrown off, and on some estates there are offers of service beyond what is required. The truth is, they were told at ———, in an unhappy moment, that they should be made to take off the crop without wages, and this impression at once spread throughout the district; so that nothing but the fact of their seeing a system of wages actually introduced, could satisfy them that it would be a reality. True it was, that when the people were at first told laconically, by the overseer, that the mill must be kept about till eight o'clock, they said, 'no night spell.' Having heard of this, and knowing the general good disposition of the people, I went on the estate on the day the mill was put about, and called them together; they assembled in the most orderly manner, and listened to my address with a degree of quiet attention and respect scarcely to be exceeded; in conclusion they one and all said, my 'word was good,' and they would do as I desired. They went to their work, and have since carried it on with a steady, persevering, diligent manner." Notwithstanding the testimony given before the House of Assembly's committee, in which there was an almost unanimous prediction that the sugar crop could not possibly be gathered, the Governor has since received assurances, from all parts of the island, like the following: "As the mills are all now about, I believe I may now safely affirm that there is not a single instance, throughout the whole district, in which any doubt is now entertained of getting off the crop." "At Golden Grove they potted last week either sixteen or seventeen hogsheads; at Holland estate nearly the same quantity. And I have the managers' own testimony, on both estates, that they never saw the people either work better or behave better. After all that your lordship has heard, I deem these facts worth communicating. Further, my lord, with respect to Golden Grove: and the statement is so gratifying as to require nothing less than the best authority, the attorney himself now informs me, that he finds they shall have potted fully as much by Christmas as they made by the same period last year." Another writer states, "We are making at the rate of 12 hogsheads a week. At this rate we shall take off a crop equal to the last, viz: 400 hogsheads, say in thirty-three weeks. The wages given in that time

will amount to 160*l.* sterling, an expenditure equivalent, as your lordship knows, to a deficiency of about ten hogsheads. When we consider, my lord, that this outlay will be more than met by the *interest* on the compensation money, that we may confidently expect an improvement in the quality of the sugar made from the abolition of night work, and that the quantity lost by plunder will be diminished. When we reflect, also, upon the number of able laborers who were converted into hospital patients, by exposure to the night air, under the former system, and consider that this evil is (if not removed) materially reduced by the new regulations. When, my lord, we give to such considerations the attention they deserve, does it not appear, provided the change is fairly met, the condition of the proprietor is rather improved than otherwise, as far as relates to the time of the apprenticeship system?" * * * "The result of their admirable exertions in sugar making up to this period is, that they have actually potted ninety hogsheads, which is five or six more than last year, the mill having, on each occasion, been put about on precisely the same day, November 5th."

The Christmas holidays passed over in all the Colonies with universal good order. In Antigua the customary military guard was wholly dispensed with, and up to this hour no disturbance had been heard of, which did not plainly originate in some effort of the planters to exercise the old authority. Here, then, is a perfect demonstration of the *safety* of the speediest possible abolition of slavery. If such abolition has been safe when the masters were coerced to it, what would it be, a fortiori, where the masters should voluntarily decree it?

ADVANCE OF THE ABOLITION CAUSE.

It is a sentiment in which we think a majority of the community concur that the murderous threats of the South and the violent denunciations of the North, will but increase the number of the abolitionists. How they will hasten the period of universal emancipation, is not so clearly seen. A careful attention to the progress of events, in the light of the past, will show, we think, that a speedy change in the relation of the planters to their laborers must result.

The labors of the abolitionists have broken up that middle ground—that bridge over the gulf, from sin to righteousness,—on which the defenders of slavery have hitherto safely stood. The mass of slaveholders are driven to the desperate position of asserting the entire justice of slavery as a system—or *in the abstract*, as it is termed. They now denounce equally all who will not stand with them—all who cherish the faintest wish or hope, that the "foul blot," "the curse," not to say "the sin," may one day be removed. Now, if it can be of any avail to array against slavery the public opinion of the non-slaveholding world, it is a manifest advantage to have driven the supporters of the system to a stand where they must be exposed to its unmitigated reprobation. As the power of public opinion is that by which the abolitionists hope to effect their object, it is plain that the present attitude of the South is to them an important victory. Nor is the importance of this victory at all diminished by the loud expression of public opinion against them at the North. Had all the speeches and resolutions of the innumerable anti-abolition meetings of the North as warmly approved the measures of the abolitionists as they have uncharitably denounced them, we sincerely

doubt whether the effect in hastening the downfall of slavery would have been better. Let us place ourselves for a moment in the shoes of a southern slave-master—a man of reflective habits, for there are such—and look at these things through his eyes. “What are our northern friends about? Their interests bind them to accede to our wishes and plead our cause. They cordially hate the abolitionists, and deprecate their measures, but yet they speak of slavery as a *great evil*, as a *blot upon our escutcheon*, and they hail the day when it shall be abolished. The expression of this sentiment, they must know, will not appease our feelings nor gain our trade; it is not therefore the language of selfish flattery, but of the conscience—the deference which even time-serving trucklers are compelled to pay to truth. To save the Union, they are ready to sacrifice the abolitionists, but yet they do not deny the correctness of their principles. They place their own non-interference with our claims not on the basis of *justice*, but of a *compact*, by which their fathers bound them—a compact which they hint could not be justly made again! Is it so? Are our claims shielded from a moral attack only by a compact? Are they so monstrously unjust that even Mammon cannot wholly blind his followers to their wickedness? Does our conduct call forth a rebuke even from men whose hearts lie in their purses, and whose purses are filled by a share in our gains?” We have studied human nature to little purpose, if such reflections have not already disturbed the quiet of many slaveholders. The northern meetings will thus goad the monster most effectually, while at the same time, they will undoubtedly tend to prevent a rash withdrawal of the South from the Union. This must not be construed into an approval of the base, hypocritical and malignant sentiments of the anti-abolition meetings, but into admiration of the providence of God which makes the wrath of man to praise him.

In the mean time this opposition presents no obstruction either at the South or the North to the progress of the doctrine of immediate emancipation. In both sections, the furious persecution of the so called “incendiary papers” greatly increases the general desire to understand their contents. The books of the Publishing Agent abundantly attest this fact. The shutting up of the mails, can by no means shut out the influence of these publications from the South. All that was expected to be accomplished by the large distribution in July, was fairly to advertise the South of the plan and power of the moral campaign. The first paper reached its destination. The bon-fires of Charleston and Richmond completed the work. A thorn now rankles in every southern conscience, which will be driven deeper by the vigilance committees and the executions of Lynch law. It were idle to expect to convert the mass of slaveholders by a diffusion of pamphlets; that can only be done by placing them under a moral embargo—by letting them see the image of their crime thrown back upon them from the moral sentiment of every non-slaveholder they meet. The work lies chiefly at the North. It cannot be retarded by any Southern Conventions or acts of non-intercourse.

He must expect a miracle who expects that public opinion can be changed on the subject of slavery without a tremendous agitation; and he must be profoundly ignorant of the character of this age who can suppose that such an agitation will result in any thing else than the abolition of slavery. Look at the effect of this agitation already. Anti-slavery societies are now springing up spontane-

ously in all parts of the land. In May they numbered 200, now they are not less than 300. The topic is one of universal conversation. There is some particle of the heaven flowing through every channel of public communication, and this particle never fails to multiply itself.

The most cheering fact is, that this cause is getting hold of the purest, most philanthropic and heavenly minded men. We could, were it proper, introduce a long list of such, whose praise is in all the churches. Is it to be supposed that persecution will render these men more apathetic to the horrors and abominations of slavery?

Should an attempt be made, as is now very probable, to suppress anti-slavery publications, by northern legislation, the speedy moral revolution of the North will be fully insured. The discussion will then be brought home to every man's 'business and bosom.' Neither money nor men will then be wanting. And, inasmuch as it is not in the power of parchment to seal the millions of mouths from which the doctrine of equal rights is wont to issue, the 'heresy' under this pressure must spread with increased rapidity. Only think of a democratic republic suppressing free discussion! Will the multitudinous waves of the sea bind themselves to hold their noisy tongues, lest oppressors should be disturbed in their guilty dreams?

THE

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

No. II.—For January, 1836.

THE right of slavery is the right of the strongest. Human bones, clothed in living muscles, are not bought up as a matter of duty. When the planter sends out his "gang" in the morning, with a whip at their heels, it is to make cotton or tobacco, and not to save *them* from the vices or woes of idleness. When he buys more "land and negroes," it is upon no nice calculation of its bearing upon the destiny of the human beings concerned. This refined speculation comes afterwards, by way of answer to the natural question, What right have you to make "chattels" of *men*? Nor is it original with the planter. Conscious that the hope of gain is his motive, he has not the hypocrisy to pretend, that he buys, holds, and drives his slaves for their *own good*. For this mantle of charity he is indebted to the convenient and ingenious moralists who eat at his table and drink of his wine, or in some other way share his profits. While the moral warfare against slavery is waged with lukewarm and heartless moderation, the *proprietor*, as he calls himself, is content to be shielded by his obliging friends. But being more hotly pressed, he resorts to his own armor, and with impudent honesty replies, "I HOLD SLAVES BECAUSE I HAVE THE POWER."

While we are writing, the slaveholders of this republic are in the act of throwing off the cloak, and their apologists are likely to find themselves in the predicament of a lawyer, who after volunteering a very ingenious and eloquent defence, should hear his client confess and glory in his crime.

In thus utterly denying the benevolence of slaveholding,

be it observed, we have denied it of the act, and not of the actors. This is not the world in which sin is permitted to work out its tendencies to the entire ruin of what God created in his own image. Hence do we see, and heartily do we rejoice in the sight, much that is good, and praiseworthy, and noble, in men whose slaveholding we are bound to condemn. We see, not seldom, even in the treatment of their slaves, the working of that humanity which is at irreconcilable war with the very tenure by which they hold those slaves. Here is our hope. Our argument is addressed to an element of the soul, which, in thousands of slaveholders, is neither dead nor dormant. And to such, the shameless avowal of a determination to *hold slaves forever*, on the part of the more hardened of their class, speaks in thunder tones: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

The issue is fast making up between slavery and no slavery. There is to be no neutral ground—no half-way-house. The friends of slavery must henceforth defend it, not as a *necessary evil*, but as a *positive good*; and having thus subverted all rational foundation for their own liberties, they must rely upon their naked swords. Slaveholders must live by profession, as they have always done by practice, under the old charter, "Might makes right." And this charter they *must teach* their slaves. Indeed, they always have taught it. How numerous and impressive the lessons;—the ever-present whip—the hand-cuffs—the stocks—the iron collar for the neck—the ball and chain! How apt the preparation for a turn of the tables, and how reasonable the dread of that just retribution! Would to God the masters would substitute for their murderous doctrine, so cruelly taught, the pure, peaceful, elevating truths of the Bible! Strange they should be so jealous of a book from which they profess to read a divine sanction for their conduct!

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. I.

JANUARY, 1836.

NO 2.

ON THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY BY GREAT BRITAIN.

BY C. STUART.

(Concluded.)

IN the spring of 1830, a large advance was made. The London Society, for *ameliorating* the condition of the oppressed and outraged subjects of Britain in the west, and for the *gradual* abolition of slavery, discarded its ameliorating and gradual visions, and set itself in earnest to work for the speedy extinction of slavery. This improvement, however, was almost nipped in the bud, by the enthusiastic proposal of one of its ardent friends. Grasping at an *immediate* object, which he thought attainable; quailing before the mustering might of the slave faction, and despairing in consequence of better things, he proposed to devote the first effort, to the liberty of *the children*, who should be born after a certain and early date; and his affectionate and elated heart poured such beauty around the idea, that it was carried almost by acclamation for the moment. But it was too recreant to duty, too false to nature and to fact, to retain its ground, and ere long it passed away. Meanwhile the spirit and principles of the society improved, and the duty of aiming steadily, and without compromise, at *immediate and thorough emancipation*, became more and more apparent.

Hitherto, the only means used by the parent society, for the attainment of its sacred objects, were, intercourse with government—parliamentary influence—occasional meetings, especially a great annual meeting in London—extensive correspondence—the ordinary press, wherever an editor could be found, not shackled by the slave influence—and

a monthly periodical of the highest order, called the Anti-Slavery Reporter, edited chiefly by one of the most talented, zealous, and upright men in the nation, Zachary Macaulay.

In 1830, the Negroes' Friend Society of Dublin, with Dr. Charles E. W. Orpen, and Major Sirr, of the castle, at its head, and animated with the deep and holy spirit of Edward Wilson, tried the effect of lecturing in Ireland. It was happy, and was extended to England in 1831, and not long afterwards to Scotland. At this time the Agency Sub-Committee was formed. The dear and generous "*Friends*" supplied chiefly the pecuniary means of every exertion. The ladies' associations of London and its neighborhood; of Birmingham and its neighborhood—of Bristol and Clifton—of Devizes—of Liverpool—of Glasgow, and of Edinburgh, distinguished themselves. Lucy Townsend and Mary Anne Schimmelpennies, married ladies, with Misses Sarah Wedgewood, Rebecca Yerbury, Lucy Riland and her sister Maria, were beyond all praise.

The modern George Knox, Andrew Thompson, of Scotland, revolutionized in part, the proud and aristocratic capital of his country. George Stephen trod gloriously in the footsteps of his noble father; and George Thompson, Edward Baldwin, Edmond Dewdney, and William T. Blair, &c.,* were raised up, either as general or local agents, salaried or independent, to pour the light of truth and love, in peace, over the land. Amongst these, as a lecturer, George Thompson had the widest sphere, and eminently distinguished himself. Ten times ten thousand hearts in Great Britain were awakened or confirmed by his powers, and blessed God for his invaluable services.

The nation began to arouse itself like a lion from its slumbers, and the slave faction, strong in the wickedness of ages, proudly encountered it with contempt and defiance. The leaders of the party in London, some of them amongst the first men in the land, met in more frequent conclave. All that influence and wealth could do, to pollute the sources of

* It is due to the writer of this article, and to the friends of humanity, that we should here say what his modesty has concealed. Not one of the laborers above mentioned acquitted himself more nobly than our friend Charles Stuart. The Agency Committee in their Report, London, 1832—thus speak of him.

"Captain CHARLES STUART, F. I. C. E. who is already well known as a persevering, uncompromising friend of the cause, with his accustomed liberality, has also given his gratuitous services, accepting no other return than his travelling expenses, and even those on the most economical scale."—Ed.

justice, was done. The press was extensively bribed—an anti-lecturer was set up—publications of the most base and delusive character, were sedulously disseminated—the colonies were in commotion, puffing out prognostics of havoc and threats of rebellion—meetings were had in the islands, and agents, staunch to despotism, sent home—mobs were attempted to be excited in England and Ireland, and some thousands of the poor slaves of Jamaica, were goaded to open destruction. It is not a new thing for oppression to make a wise man mad. Eccles. vii. 7. What wonder, therefore, when it drives the poor and the ignorant to desperation; and with what sacred pity should we regard, and with what benignant tenderness should we seek to reclaim them.

It is said that slave masters are remarkably brave: it should have been said that they are remarkable bullies. In licentious squabbles, in the *point of honor*, in boasting and in threats, in wrong and rapine, *bold*; but, in real danger, or what they deem real danger—in repenting of wrong, or in restoring right, they are as pusillanimous as spoilt children. I speak not this of all, but of the multitude. What are my proofs? Look to Jamaica in 1831–2.

They are big with defiance. What is the power of Great Britain to their violence? They scoff at it. They drive some thousands of their poor slaves to desperation. They dismiss all pity. They embody their militia, and breathing slaughter, march exultingly to the pursuit. A few hundred half armed wretches—wretches in misery more than in crime—no, but not half armed—scarcely armed at all—meet them, and they retreat to Montego Bay, and cry out for a company—even if it be but one company of the king's troops to hasten and rescue them;—the company comes, their terrors are over, they glut themselves with blood, and again bristle up and defy the nation!

Look at Virginia about the same time.

A few poor creatures, stung to that despair, which makes even cowards brave, put off their native passiveness, assumed the white man, and usurped for a fearful moment, the privilege of outrage and slaughter. They and their coadjutors, and many others, no more connected with them in their deeds of blood than I am, but guilty *only* of being of that same outraged class and color, perished beneath the white man's fury. How unspeakably more desirable to every just

and generous emotion of the soul, *their* perishing, than the triumph of their destroyers! But *now*, the *delicate question*—the question of slavery, which *before* and *since* must not be breathed, was brought, without hesitation into broad daylight, and discussed as freely and as publicly as it deserved! Why? Not because slave masters are brave as a body, but because they are pusillanimous. Were they brave, they would *constantly look the whole danger in the face*, as they then did when goaded for the moment to madness by terror: and soon with adoring and rejoicing hearts they would discover, what a free and happy peasantry they might immediately have round them, instead of the sullen, smothered, writhing, indignant and stupified heart of the slave.

But the insurrection in Jamaica, thus produced by despotism, and thus put down in blood, was connected with other most important results:—

The opportunity was too plausible to be lost—"The Anti-Slavery Society"—"the interference of the home government"—"and the Sectarians, (the missionaries,) chiefly Baptist and Methodist) have caused it all," vociferated the tyrants and murderers—"We must be revenged." The Anti-Slavery Society was beyond their reach—The Government providentially was preserved from their power,—But the missionaries were in the midst of them—Upon the missionaries, therefore, they poured out their wrath, restrained only by the terrors of the nation which they disgraced. Almost all the Baptist and several of the Methodist churches were outrageously pulled down. Meetings for religious worship were tyrannically forbidden—and the ministers were hunted like wild beasts—many of their lives were endangered—several of them were cast into prison—against one (Mr. Burchell) perjury was suborned. The harmless Moravian was assailed. The magnanimous and faithful William Knibb, was particularly execrated, and a "*Church Union*" was formed to expel the *Sectarians* (meaning the Baptists and Methodists) from the island. The little flock of Christ with their pastors, were scattered like sheep upon the mountains.

And now the slaveholders of Jamaica began to think their work complete, and to rejoice by anticipation in the unwatched and unbridled exercise of despotism, when all the missionaries should be out of the way—I mean, *all the*

missionaries who would not enter into their sympathies and excuse their crimes—of course there were *some* of *one heart* with them, and *these*, of course, they exalted to the skies. Burchell was obliged to fly, taking advantage of an American vessel, which opportunely was sailing for the United States—Knibb (the Baptist) and Watson (the Methodist) two great-souled Christian men, it was deemed best by their friends to send to England—all would have been ruin for the time, but for the wisdom and energy of Lord Mulgrave, the recently appointed governor.

But God was taking the proud in their own toils.

The Slave faction in England, again and again had urged inquiry. Their object was delay. They knew their own strength—and they knew how difficult it ever must be, to keep together an extensive association of pure benevolence, wound up to that holy intensity of feeling and of action, which are needed in the battles of the Lord. The Government and the Anti-Slavery Society showed them how ample the inquiry had already been, and how thorough and extensive the information gained. Still they urged *inquiry*; and just at this time, obtained such an ascendancy in the House of Lords, that they carried their object, and a Committee of Inquiry was appointed, consisting chiefly, (as is usual in such cases,) of members of the party, which had obtained it. Providentially there was a *Lord Suffield*, in the House of Lords; and he was appointed of this committee.

The friends of liberty in the House of Commons, alarmed at this victory of the Slave faction in the Upper House, moved through their excellent leader, T. F. Buxton for a Committee of Inquiry in the Commons also. These two committees sat about the same time. And almost at the moment that they began to sit, arrived the persecuted missionaries from Jamaica!!!

The inquiry which ensued was triumphant in behalf of righteousness. The evidence in the Legislature against Slavery was overwhelming. George Stephen was a giant in the cause. Wm. Knibb went through the island, pouring the woes and wrongs of the slaves, into the sympathizing bosoms of the free. The nation was electrified, and the progress of political reform then in its vigor, hastened the crisis of the question. The principles of *immediate*

and thorough duty, for some time past, had been continually gaining ground—and at this time, were loudly professed by the Anti-Slavery societies, throughout the empire. The half-hearts, the abstract-haters of slavery, had retired from the contest, or had gone over to the educational plan. The electors became more and more influenced by the spirit of impartial liberty, and petitions multiplied more and more.

The crisis came. Earl Grey and Lord Brougham, were at the head of the administration. The Colonial Secretaries, Lords Goderich and Howick, were enlightened, upright, and firm. T. F. Buxton, led on to the Parliamentary contest, nobly. The king was passive. The West Indians mustered to the battle; they found it impossible any longer to defer the final conflict, and they put forth all their strength, in order to mould it as much as possible to their purposes. The House of Lords, including the Bishops, as a body were on their side.

They gained an important advantage to their cause, by obtaining the substitution in the colonial secretaryship, of Messrs. Stanley and Lefevre, for Lords Goderich and Howick.

Mr. Buxton was known to be prepared to urge the question of immediate abolition early in the session. Mr. Stanley, as minister of the crown, took it out of his hands by pledging himself to introduce without delay, a measure which should be “safe and satisfactory to all parties.” This measure was expected with deep anxiety.

But the friends of liberty saw too much ground of apprehension in the sudden change of the colonial secretaries, and in Mr. Stanley’s indefinite and unexplained terms, to be at ease. A deputation therefore was determined upon. Three hundred and thirty-one of the noblest minds, selected by the nation, hastened to London, and waiting upon the ministers, earnestly urged the prayer of the nation’s heart. They were received with respect, and the above mentioned pledge was solemnly renewed to them. The hopes of the friends of liberty were warm—but the slave faction was indefatigable.

Mr. Stanley’s plan appeared May 14th, 1833. It was properly speaking a West Indian plan—not such a plan by any means, as the West Indians, if left to themselves, would have devised—but just such a plan, as unflinching despo-

tism and cupidity would grasp at *in their condition*. It began plausibly, by proposing to abolish slavery immediately ; but it proceeded to substitute an apprenticeship of twelve years for slavery, and besides, to give the slave faction £15,000,000 for the loss which it pretended they would sustain.

The leaders of the Anti-Slavery Society were shaken. They could not indeed look upon the plan, as either safe or satisfactory ; but in the substitution of a limited and comparatively short period of vastly mitigated bondage, for interminable slavery of the most ferocious description, they saw within their grasp, an inestimable boon, and trembling at the idea of losing it, they compromised their principles. Immediate and thorough emancipation was let go, and the claim of compensation was allowed to entangle the question.

But there were many, with the Agency Sub-Committee at their head, who could not thus wave their principles. They could not concur a moment in the substitution of the *mitigation*, for the *abolition of sin* ; especially, of sin of such an aggravated nature as colonial slavery ! The law of God, which prohibits all iniquity and all participation in all iniquity, was as precious to them as ever, and they saw no reason in the craft of His enemies, for beginning to mistrust His truth. The pursuit of the immediate and thorough emancipation of their poor and outraged fellow subjects, from iniquitous and cruel bondage, became not less a paramount duty in their estimation, because tyranny in its dying struggles sought to mutilate it. They recalled their leaders to the glorious principles of uncompromising righteousness which they had asserted together, and which had been the mighty cement of their union.

They were kindly listened to, and their remonstrances were of some avail. The length of the apprenticeship was decidedly refused—and when Mr. Stanley declared to a deputation, which was appointed to wait upon him by the united committee, that he could not shorten the twelve years, the question was promptly referred to the people.

The minister, and the slave faction, felt obliged to bend. They offered and carried a compromise. It was, that slavery, *so called*, should cease in all the British slave colonies, on the first of August, 1834. That from that day, a species of apprenticeship should begin, and continue with the non-

prædial (non-agricultural) slaves for four years, (1st August, 1838,) and with the prædial (agricultural) slaves for six years, or until August 1st, 1840. That the children, under six years of age, on the first of August, 1834, should be free ; but might, at the discretion of their parents, be apprenticed to their former masters, until of age. And that in consideration of the loss which it was pretended the slaveholders were to undergo, £20,000,000 of the national money should be paid to them.

The triumph was glorious, but incomplete. The law of God, though less outrageously trampled under foot, yet remained broken. The British law was only partially vindicated. The wrongs and sufferings of the guiltless, and outraged poor, were mitigated—greatly mitigated—but not remedied. Slavery, though shorn of its lordly port, as a triumphant pirate, yet preyed upon the colonies, under the form of apprenticeship, a legalized robber ! And still the cry of the laborers' wages, kept back by force and fraud, went up to heaven against the nation.

But still the friends of liberty rejoiced. Good, *much* good, was done. Tyranny received a blow, from which it will probably never recover—and the glorious day seems at hand, when all heaven's atmosphere, within the boundaries of Britain's empire, shall be "*too pure for a slave to breathe in.*"

Meanwhile, the apprenticeship, generally speaking, works well.* The colored people, by peaceable continuance in well doing—by still, in their patience, possessing their souls : by unwearied quietness and submissiveness, are putting to shame the aspersions of their enemies, and proving how eminently fit they are to be entrusted with their sacred and unforfeited rights as men ! And how criminal, insane and cruel, is the system, which will still go on to oppress and plunder them.

But in two of the late British slave colonies a happier state of things has arisen. Antigua and Bermudas, instead of accepting the base and pernicious substitute of apprenticeship, immediately proceeded to emancipation. On the first of August, 1834, their slaves became freemen. Their soil is pure—God hears no longer the cry of outrage and of blood against them. Danger, which still hangs over the other colonies, because mischief continues to be framed by law there, has rolled away from *them* ; and, in the harmo-

* Well for the cause of freedom, though oppressive to the apprentice.—ED.

nizing of the interests of all, by impartial law, the firmest pledge exists of their future happiness.

In the winter of 1833, the Agency Sub-Committee of London, having completed its short and glorious course, came to an end: but from its ashes immediately arose a new society, the object of which is, to obtain the abolition of slavery, *throughout the world*. Its leaders were George Stephen, and the two Coopers. Its secretary is John Scoble. Its friends are, the noblest hearts in Britain. George Thompson, grossly slandered by ignorance and falsehood in the United States, honored and beloved by those who have long known and tried him, is its agent. It moves forward firmly in peace and love, utterly rejecting all carnal weapons; superior alike to the provocations and the blandishments, which are on its way; not to be provoked to retaliation by insult—not to be deterred by threats or reviling, from its holy course. Above the baseness of flattery, it cannot cringe to wickedness however lordly, nor does the brazen front of hypocrisy, bold and lawless, daunt it. The law of God and of brotherly kindness is in its heart. The love of Christ constrains it, that even as he loved man, so should it love man, irrespectively of physical diversities, and labor with him, and under him, “to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prisons to them that are bound—to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God.” Isa. lxi. 1, 2. To hasten the time, when *all* men, shall unite with the heavenly host in acclaiming, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will towards men.”

I cannot conclude without stating, that amidst the deep and general degeneracy of the slave factions, noble exceptions arose; men and women, who, with double heroism, cast off the fetters of their nature, and their circumstances and their class, and dared to be just and humane—*just*, by restoring to their slaves their full and unforfeited freedom; and *humane*, by continuing afterwards their disinterested friends—even such men as Moses Brown, of Providence, and J. G. Birney, of Kentucky. Within my own little knowledge, I could name several such; and a larger number of an inferior grade, who, though they remained slave masters; *unnecessarily*, yet within the limits of that cruel and crying iniquity, did all they could to mitigate their own sin, and to

alleviate the degradation of their helpless bondmen. Such men as these last, forget him who "went away sorrowing, having great possessions," Matth. xix. 16-22, they forget, Gal. iii. 10, and James ii. 10. Of the former description, a female instance may be here recorded.

Mrs. Stumbles, of Stonehouse, near Plymouth, England, in 1829, had a small slave property in Nevis, West Indies, bequeathed to her, in connection with her brother, who was manager of a slave estate in that beautiful island. To her share, fell *four* slaves; two women, one man, and one little boy. God said to her, *through the bequest*, "here are four of my suffering poor—I put them into your power, that you may deliver them—let them go, that they may serve me!" She at once determined to obey—no subterfuge of *inheritance* clouded her faith. But how should she proceed? Could she confide the cause to her brother? No! He was a slave master, and she knew him too well. Could she hire an agent? None such was within her reach. With an infant in her arms, and in straitened circumstances, what could she do? She did, as the woman of old, "what she could." With her babe in her arms, she crossed the ocean and arrived in Nevis. Her brother met her with scorn; the surrounding slave masters sought to daunt her with threats and reviling; the slave laws filled her way with perplexity; but, burning with holy love, cheered on of God, supported by the laws of her country, and refreshed with many local sympathies, she persevered and succeeded. She fulfilled the divine commission, and returned with the smiles of God, and the blessing of his delivered poor, to her native country.

Mr. Rice, a talented and generous young Methodist minister, then in Nevis, was returning to England the ensuing year. When about to depart, he inquired where he might best get some shells, preserves, &c. to take with him as a present to his friends in England. The two women, lately emancipated by Mrs. Stumbles, were mentioned to him, amongst others. He went to them, and they readily displayed their little stock. "What is the price?" said Mr. Rice. "Massa," they replied, "we no want to sell 'em." "Come, come, tell me what you want, I will give you a good price." "Massa, we already tell you, we no want to sell 'em." "Why, what is the matter—what are you going to do with

them?" "Oh Massa, no matter 'bout dat—we no want to sell 'em if you please." All this was said with so much courtesy and sweetness, united with decision, that Rice's curiosity was excited, and he entreated to know their reasons. They replied, when they could no longer meekly refuse, "Massa, you no hear 'bout our good Missis, how she love us? How she come, wid her little pickaniny in her arms, all across de great sea, to make us free; and how mad her broder, and de oder buckra gentlemens wid her; and all de trouble she got for we; and you tink Massa we now can forget her? No! Massa, we neber can forget her; derefore we getting dese tings Massa, to send to her to England, to tell her how much we love her always."

Why, alas! will not the mighty learn, that love *wins*, with peace and sweetness, what force wades in vain through tears and blood, to *compel*.

PRO-SLAVERY TESTIMONY EXAMINED.

BY THE EDITOR.

WE resume the consideration of the actual condition of the slaves, as indicated by the admissions of pro-slavery writers. In this class we have good right to reckon Mr. Clay, of Bryan County, Georgia, whose "Detail of a plan for the moral improvement of negroes on plantations," has no reference to abolition, and who after full application of his plan upon his own plantation, still continues a slaveholder.

It is not the purpose of Mr. Clay to describe the condition of the slaves, but to point out the duties of the masters. Among these duties he gives a prominent place to the *encouragement and regulation of marriage*. The master is not only to give or withhold consent to the union, according to his discretion, but he is to be the arbiter of family quarrels. And in his office of peacemaker, as well as in his other offices, he can act by *proxy*. Mr. Clay advises that, "All disputes should first be brought to the *Driver*, and if he cannot restore peace, let the Master, or Overseer interfere." To say nothing of the wisdom of this advice, it reveals one important fact, viz: that there are upon plantations certain functionaries called *drivers*. We are not

informed by Mr. Clay what is the precise nature of their office, nor with what badges and insignia they are dignified. We presume, however, that they have more to do than to make peace between husbands and wives. The name which they bear is significant, and could not be applied to them unless they were clothed with sufficient physical power to make their commands respected.

This testimony of Mr. Clay clearly proves that the power of licensing and regulating marriages lies absolutely with the master. "His breath can make them," and is it too much to suppose that it can *unmake* them? What *man* hath joined together, why should not man put asunder? For our own part, we want no proof that man has here usurped the place of God. He first takes it upon himself to superintend the pairing of human beings, as if they were the cattle of his field, and then, if quarrels arise, he settles them by the authority of a *driver*! From what chapter of the Holy Scriptures does he get his warrant for this interference? Was a policy of this sort resorted too on the plantation of Abraham?

"Particular attention should be paid to the manner in which they *treat animals*. They are prone to abuse, to overwork, and to treat them severely. They should be taught that a merciful man is merciful to his beast; and reminded of the peculiar claims to their compassion, presented by *those who stand in the same relation to them, that they hold to their masters*: and as they expect kind treatment from their masters, so should they extend the same to the creatures submitted to their power. They should not be permitted to keep dogs, hogs, &c. unless they can afford to feed them sufficiently, without stinting themselves and children. One of the greatest pests on a plantation is a pack of mangy, starving curs, they steal to escape starvation, and are then most unmercifully beaten: the children seeing the cruelty of their parents, soon learn to imitate them, and both children and parents vent upon the poor animals, *that passion which has been excited by some object beyond their power.*"

Are we not taught by this passage, that the cruelty of the slaves is at *second hand*? Is it to be supposed that these poor people do more than to repay in kind to the brute creation, those frequent kicks, cuffs, and beatings which they themselves receive from "some object beyond their power"? We think that Mr. Clay has here not only stated a fact, but afforded a reason for its existence, without which it would be utterly inexplicable. The poor are not usually cruel to animals, especially to dogs, which in most hovels may be seen sharing with their masters on very equal terms. But it seems that slaves are fond of having dogs, for the very purpose of inflicting upon them the vengeance awakened

by their own superiors. They not only beat, but starve them. And why should they not? Do they learn a better lesson of those who hold to them the same relation that they hold to their dogs?

The evils which flow from man's taking the place of God, are more fully apparent from what Mr. Clay says of "*crimes and punishments.*" He recommends a very deliberate and careful investigation of all charges, in presence of all the slaves. He has even "heard of two large plantations, the management of which was particularly good, where no negro was punished except by the verdict of a number of his fellow-slaves, who acted as jurors." Be it observed, that on these plantations the management was "*particularly good.*" So much is self-government better than arbitrary power. The best managed plantations are those where the slaves are treated most like free men. For as our witness justly remarks, "publicity of trial tends to establish among them a sense of character, which will do more towards the restraint of vice and crime, than can be effected alone, by any mode of punishment." But is such wise lenity common in the government of slaves? Hear Mr. Clay:—

"There are several *prevailing* errors connected with crime and punishment in the present system of plantation discipline. And first, there exists a wrong scale of crime. Offences against the *master*, are more severely punished than violations of the law of God, or faults which affect the slave's personal character or good. As examples, we may notice, that running away, is more severely punished than adultery, and idleness than Sabbath breaking, and swearing; and stealing from the master, than defrauding a fellow slave. Under the influence of such a code as this, it cannot be a matter of surprise that the negro forms false estimates of the comparative criminality of actions. And further the general mode of inflicting punishments, tends to confound these distinctions. The *whip* is the general instrument of correction, and so long as a negro is whipped without discrimination for neglect of work, for stealing, lying, Sabbath breaking, and swearing, he will very naturally class them all together as belonging to the same grade of guilt. In a good code of discipline, the punishment will always be suited to the nature and enormity of the crime; and it is highly important that this measure should be well adjusted, for the common people will judge of the criminality of the act, by the nature and extent of the punishment.

Another error, is obvious in the defective presentation of the design of punishment. The negro is seldom taught to feel, that he is punished for breaking God's law. He only knows his *master* as lawgiver and executioner, and the sole object of punishment held up to his view, is to make him a *more obedient and profitable slave*. He oftener hears that he shall be punished if he steals, than if he breaks the Sabbath, or swears; and thus he sees the very threatenings of God, brought to bear upon his master's interests. It is very manifest to him that *his own good* is very far from forming the primary reason for his chastisement; his master's interests are to be secured at all events;—God's claims are secondary, or enforced merely for the purpose of advancing those of his owner. His own benefit is the residuum after this double distillation of moral motive—a mere accident."

Now, what sort of a system, in its practical operation, must that be, where such "*errors*" prevail? where a power of punishment, limited only in theory, is lodged in the hands of individuals, which they confessedly exercise for their *own interests*, and not for the good of the slave? Truly, Mr. Clay has good reason to say "God's claims are secondary"! Whatever may be the case on his plantation, we give full credence to his testimony that the whip is no where else much used for the good of the soul. Let us endeavor to picture in our imagination the pious master enforcing "God's claims" with the *whip*. His slaves, according to the advice of Mr. Clay, are assembled at "evening prayers." One of them is accused by the *driver* of violating the *third commandment*! As this crime is evidently greater than "running away," or "idleness," the punishment must be more severe than for those delinquencies. The pious master, therefore, having finished the evening devotions, as it would ill comport with his dignity to take the cow-hide or cart-whip into his own hands, directs the driver to administer *thirty-nine lashes*, well laid on. The culprit is stripped, laid upon his face, and held down by four stout slaves, while the driver executes the pious sentence. It will be perceived at once that the efficacy of this punishment will depend much upon the character of the driver. If he be a profane swearer himself, it is not difficult to perceive the effect upon the gang. Whether the drivers and overseers, whom Mr. Wirt has described as the "feculum of the human race," are likely to afford many individuals who can consistently enforce "God's claims," with the instruments of their office, the reader can judge as well as we.

Mr. Clay plainly testifies to the fact, that the master stands to the slave, in the place of the civil law, as well as the divine. Hence that unfrequency of legal convictions, which is quoted by slaveholders as a proof of the good moral tendency of slavery:—

"The *civil offences* of negroes are too often punished on the plantations, instead of being prosecuted according to law. They should be taught that they are subject to the laws of the State, both when they violate those laws, and when they are violated in their person. The fear of corporal punishment is the only motive peculiar to a system of slavery; but if we desire to promote right conduct, for its moral, not pecuniary advantage, moral motives must be exhibited, for the character of an action partakes primarily of the nature of its motive. Should the fear of punishment alone deter the slave from stealing, he would still be desti-

tute of the principle of honesty—of that which constitutes a moral trait in his forbearance to take what belongs to another ”

Now, we should like to be present, when the masters substitute “moral motives” for that which is “peculiar to slavery.” At that moment would the moral question, of the right or wrong of slavery itself, be brought into debate between master and slave ;—unless, indeed, the “moral motives” should be administered sub terrore—with whip in hand to prevent “discussion.” The presentation of “moral motives” implies, that the being to whom they are addressed has a moral sense, consequently he cannot fail to perceive, that what justifies the master in taking the slave, body and soul, will justify the slave in taking a pig or chicken from the master. It will be a miracle if the master does not meet an insuperable difficulty, in this argument, whenever he resorts to the “moral” mode of government. Even in the theory of the benevolent Mr. Clay, however, the *whip*, or something of that sort, has its place ; how much more then in the actual practice, which his plan is designed to ameliorate ! After having strongly advised the use of moral influence, he adds, “Physical suffering and restraint, however, must still enter into a system of discipline intended for beings of a compound nature. As men commit immoral actions from physical motives, so immorality may be punished, and morality encouraged, by considerations appealing to the senses.”

Mr. Clay’s testimony to the general coerciveness of slavery is not yet completed. He illustrates the forceful and oppressive character of that institution, upon which he would engraft kindness and persuasion, in varied forms. We fearlessly assert, that it is not in the power of language to convey to an *intelligent* mind, a picture more replete with horrors, than that which is contained in the following honest admissions. Remember, they are descriptive of the *general practice* of men, who have absolute power.

“Encouragement does not enter much into the discipline of plantations, as at present conducted. *To be let alone*, when the master’s task is done, is the *only* condition offered as an inducement to the industry necessary to accomplish it, or secure an exemption from the punishment due for the neglect of it. Masters do not sufficiently acquaint themselves with the wants of their negroes. They are too prone to think them well supplied, when they have received their clothes and allowance, *particularly if the pint of salt once a month is not forgotten.*”

Again he says :—

"The present economy of the slave system is, *to get all you can from the slave, and give in return as little as will barely support him in WORKING CONDITION.* Where there is not direct intention to infringe his comforts, they are but little consulted, and seeing his master wholly engrossed by his own advantage, he naturally adopts the same selfish course, and when not restrained by higher principles, becomes deceitful and thievish, and as it is generally taken for granted, *that the negro will steal and lie*, and his master takes no pains to conceal his suspicions, he feels when tempted to do either, that he has no character to lose."

After this we want no array of whips, stocks, chains, iron neck-collars, and perforated paddles—no display of lacerated backs—no tally of stripes—no parting scenes of husband and wife—no details of gaunt starvation. We roll the burden of proof upon the masters. *They* must show us, that they are not of the *same race* with Pygmalion, Pizarro, and the wretch Collingwood, who threw one hundred and thirty-two sick slaves from the deck of the ship *Zong*, on the middle passage, to defraud the underwriters ! Commend us to speedy death, by no matter what instruments of torture, when we are brought to depend for a pittance upon a fellow worm, whose economy it is, for his own selfish ends, "barely to support" us in "WORKING CONDITION." We are subject to a despot who has forgotten that we have a soul ; whose will is restrained by no superior law, which stupidity itself might not evade ; whose interests are built on the ruin of ours ; whose heart is soothed by our groans, and whose all absorbing claim grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength. If there is any consolation for the miserable victims of such oppression, truly, it must come from *another world*.

We now return to the "Essay on the management of slaves, and especially on their religious instruction ; read before the Agricultural Society of St. John's, Colleton : by WHITEMARSH B. SEABROOK, President. Published by order of the Society. Charleston, 1834." The testimony of the Hon. Mr. Seabrook was adduced, in our last number, to show that the masters consider their slaves their "lawful property," and exercise over them "executive, legislative, and judicial powers," with no restraint that is more than nominal. We shall be able to derive from it further light, both as to the physical and the moral condition of the slaves. We wish it to be observed, that this is, in effect, the testimony of a *society* of slaveholders. That the witness is

thoroughly pro-slavery, will appear from one of his "preliminary observations."

"In the first place, I must be permitted to say, that, in the judgment of my fellow-citizens, slavery is not inconsistent with the laws of nature or of God. The Bible informs us, that it was established and sanctioned by divine authority among even the elect of heaven, and the history of every age and country attests, that personal servitude has been the lot of a considerable portion of mankind. I believe, moreover, that successfully to carry on the great business of the world, slavery in some form is as necessary as the division of labor itself."

The common cry is, that the slaves, after all, are as well treated as the laboring class of any country. They are as free, in point of fact, as the laborers of the north. But we are led to suspect a difference which is quite important, when we see Mr. Seabrook place among "considerations which should never be lost sight of," in the management of slaves, such as the following:—

"1. That the conduct of the slave is not to be regulated entirely by the same rules which are so well calculated to insure the faithfulness of the white servant."

An employer that would insure the faithful services of a free laborer, must not only exercise a watchful supervision, but he must pay a just and delicate regard to the *rights* of the laborer. In the latter respect, it must be, that a different rule is recommended for the slave. Indeed, what can be plainer than, that the rule of Mr. Seabrook, which immediately follows the above, betrays an entire disregard of the *rights* of the slave, as a man, and recommends the holding of him in the capacity of a brute, as essential to the system?

"2. As slavery exists in South Carolina, the action of the citizen should *rigidly conform to that state of things*. If abstract opinions of the rights of man are allowed in any instance to modify the *police system of a plantation*, the authority of the master, and the value of his estate, will be as certainly impaired, as that the peace of the blacks themselves will be injuriously affected. Whoever believes slavery to be immoral or illegal, and, under that belief, frames a code of laws for the government of his people, is practically an enemy of the state. Such a person is utterly unfit to fulfil the obligations of his trust, and the most acceptable service he could render his fellow-citizens, would be to emigrate with his property to the land of the Tappans and the Garrisons."

Let it be here observed, that it is not the "abstract opinions" that impair the "value of an estate," but modifying the "police system" in accordance with such opinions of the "*rights of man*." No matter whether those "abstract opinions" are just or erroneous, if they are opinions in relation to the "rights of man," and are permitted to modify the common "police system of a plantation," they work out mis-

chief. Under the ban of this rule would certainly fall those "two large plantations" spoken of by Mr. Clay, where no negro was punished except by the verdict of a *jury* of his fellow slaves; and of which he testifies that the management was "*particularly good*." On these plantations the "police system," was either modified by abstract opinions on the *rights of man*, or, what is practically the same, it so appeared to be to the public. Now, the bearing of this testimony is on this point. What must be the general treatment of the slaves where a modification of the "police system," either really or apparently in favor of *human rights*, no matter how successful or profitable in its operation, *cannot be tolerated*? Most assuredly *bad*. There can be no more doubt of it, than that the building into which fire must never be introduced, is a magazine of powder, or dangerous combustibles. If the general "police system" worked happily for the slave, the mischiefs of modification would be confined to the individuals directly concerned, and the body of slaveholders would be neither hurt nor scared. Testimony could not, by any possibility, be stronger to the fact, that the RIGHTS OF THE SLAVE are practically disregarded, than that which proves that no modifications, which have these rights for their basis, will be allowed. It is to very little purpose, that Mr. Seabrook after propounding such a rule, declares that the slave, "amply provided with food and raiment, protected in his person, and without the cares that pollute the stream of the white man's happiness, toils in peace and contentment." Food, raiment, and protection are among the rights of the slave, acquired by his labor; if they are, in general practice, justly conceded, where is the danger of conceding them in accordance with a just *abstract theory* of the "rights of man"? Either, then, there are other *rights*, which in general practice are violated, or the rule of Mr. Seabrook is nugatory, and based upon a false view of *facts*, under his daily observation. The slaveholder may talk of *men* toiling in "peace and contentment" under the coercive lash, but no "food," "raiment" or "protection," can reconcile it with common sense. We take the liberty, however, from the principles avowed by this Agricultural Society of St. Johns, utterly to disbelieve in the sufficiency of food, raiment, and protection, furnished by them to their slaves. They proceed to say, in the lan-

guage of their president, "He (the slave) should be **PRACTICALLY TREATED AS A SLAVE**, and thoroughly taught the true cardinal principle on which our peculiar institutions are founded. viz: that to his *owner* he is bound by the laws of God and man, and that no human authority can sever the link which unites them. The great aim, then, of the slaveholder should be to keep his people in strict *subordination*. In this, it may in truth be said, lies his **ENTIRE DUTY**." And how is the "true cardinal principle" to be taught?—morally? That would lead to a discussion of "abstract opinions on the rights of man." Of course, it is to be taught *physically*. Let us be no longer deceived. Men do not go to the expense of such abominable *principles*, except for the profits of an equally abominable *practice*. The atrocities of hierarchal usurpation may be learnt as plainly from the corrupt doctrines of the jesuit fathers, as from the infernal racks, and pincers, and thumb-screws, and iron boots, and auto da fes of the "Holy Inquisition."

Mr. Seabrook's paragraphs in regard to the punishments of slaves, throw so strong a light upon the great American house of bondage, that we quote them entire, bespeaking the reader's careful attention.

"How ought slaves to be punished? On this subject we may safely appeal to experience. It is certain that no punishment is equally efficient in every case. Whilst the occasional application of the whip tends greatly to preserve the obedience of some, it is not even dreaded by others. Under these circumstances the slaveholder is bound to study thoroughly the character of his people—to watch their conduct with a sleepless eye, in order to discover the secret spring of their actions. The punishments usually resorted to are—1st. Corporal. 2d. Solitary confinement in stocks, or solitary confinement alone. 3d. Deprivation of privileges. 4th. Additional labor. 5th. Transportation. When corporal punishment is inflicted pursuant to a law of the state, the slave can receive but 39 stripes; it is seldom indeed that the owner gives as many. This mode of arresting the commission of crime *cannot be dispensed with*. In many cases it is the only instrument which can confidently be relied on to meliorate the character of the refractory delinquent. If to our army the disuse of the lash has been prejudicial, to the slaveholder it would operate to deprive him of the main support to his authority. For the first class of offences, I consider imprisonment in the stocks at night, with or without hard labor in the day, as a powerful auxiliary in the cause of good government. His regular duty having been performed, the slave anticipates the approach of night with the liveliest emotions. To him it is the period when he can freely indulge in the various inclinations of the mind. *Then*, unrestrained and unwatched, if I may be allowed the expression, he acts in any manner which his interest or his pleasure might dictate. Deprive him of this great source of enjoyment—take from him these hours usually passed with his associates, and you readily accomplish that which no other known scheme has yet effected. To the correctness of this opinion, many can bear testimony. Experience has convinced me, that there is no punishment to which the slave looks with more horror than

that upon which I am commenting, and none which has been attended with happier results.

Among the privileges of the slave, may be considered that of *task work*. When his daily labor is finished, he is at liberty to cultivate his crop, or otherwise to attend to his own concerns. For some offences the changing of task work into constant labor from sun to sun, reserving a short period only for meals, is a wise and useful regulation. To this punishment, if the crime be of an aggravated nature, the withholding from the transgressor his usual portion of tobacco, meat and other comforts might be added. Another very efficacious means of correcting bad conduct, is the imposition of labor additional to the task work. For theft, this is a rational punishment. It is proper on ordinary principles, that the slave by his labor should compensate for the loss, which, through his knavery, the master has sustained. Whenever it is obvious that the character of the criminal is not likely to be amended by any of the means to which I have so briefly adverted, or, that frequent recurrence to rigorous punishment, is unavoidable to attain that end, it is far better to expel him from society than to contaminate it by his example."

The ingenuity of this plan of punishments cannot be denied. With a perfection of cruelty which commends it to the deepest execration of every generous heart, it is adapted to meet all cases and tempers—to bring every face to the grind-stone of oppression. With consummate anatomical skill it passes its fingers over every slave, finds the spot where he *feels* most sensibly, and cries, There apply the pincers—there let the iron enter the soul. The stocks! What has inspired the Hon. Mr. Seabrook with his high admiration of this effectual punishment? How did he come to set so great value upon its "*happier results*" as an "auxiliary in the cause of good (!) government?" The answer deserves to be weighed. "*Experience*" has convinced him, "that there is no punishment to which the slave looks with more horror"! Yes EXPERIENCE!!!—not his own, we are sorry to say, but that of the wretched slave! He has discovered by actual experiments upon the human flesh in his possession, that confinement in the stocks *by night*, will produce a given amount of "horror," with less waste of time from the master's service, than any other mode of giving pain. Hence he admires it! Does any one, in his simplicity, suppose that the planters of Colleton District have failed to avail themselves of the "experience" of this distinguished President of an Agricultural Society? Does any one suppose that a poor wretch groaning all night, with his feet fast in those cursed appliances, is a rare phenomenon of cruelty in the neighborhood of Mr. Seabrook's well managed plantation? Argument will be lost on the doubter. It was wholly unnecessary for Mr. Seabrook to allege that "many could bear testimony" to the correctness

of his opinion ; if there were *any* who could keep their seats and smother their indignation under his avowals, the fact was proof enough that they were hardened by participation in the guilt. What ! is it not enough to take the poor man's wages—the fruit of his hard toil—his wife and children ? Must the tyrant seize his slumbers too, and chain his very dreams ? This is stealing from the famishing, throwing wormwood into the last dregs of comfort. We care not a straw for the guilt or innocence of the culprit, such a punishment, so administered, would be an outrage upon a devil ! Yet on the irrefragable testimony of slaveholders themselves, *it is a common practice !*

But the physical cruelty of slavery, great as it is, is by no means the darkest feature in the foul system. The herding together of human beings as brutes, and the exclusion to a great extent, of the healthful influences of the gospel, have induced a licentiousness which is far more lamentable than toil and stripes, or even the barbarous stocks. Abolitionists have been much accused for their sweeping charges, on this subject. But it will be seen from Mr. Seabrook, that the slaves owe little thanks to their masters if the whole is not true. He says, "in general the intercourse between servants is as unrestrained as the most unbridled ambition could desire. The daily business of the plantation having been finished, the power of the master practically ceases. He knows not, and apparently cares not, in what way the hours of the night are passed by his people." "Polygamy," says Mr Seabrook, "was at one time a common crime : it is now of rare occurrence." The change is not difficult to account for. Marriage is less frequent. A general system of concubinage prevails. Hence it is not without reason that pro-slavery writers urge upon masters the duty of encouraging marriages. In the true spirit of his system, Mr. Seabrook declares, that "every attempt to violate the moral law on this subject ought not only to be frustrated, but punished with exemplary severity." It is quite obvious that this advice is lost upon the master while "he knows not, and apparently cares not, in what way the hours of the night are passed by his people." But were the master disposed to enforce the obligations of the moral law it seems that he might be frustrated. "Between slaves on the same plantation," says Mr. S. "there is a deep sympa-

thy of feeling which binds them so closely together, that a crime committed by one of their number is seldom discovered through their instrumentality." It is true our author proposes a plan for overcoming this difficulty, but it is not easy to see how virtue will be the gainer by it. His advice is, "if your investigations prove unsuccessful, rather than that the law should be violated with impunity, *it is far better that the whole plantation should be punished.*" We have the charity to suppose that such comprehensive injustice is seldom resorted to in behalf of the *moral* law.

What is the amount of *religious instruction* enjoyed by the slaves? On this point the pamphlet of Mr. Seabrook affords a strong light. To all who are blessed with that valuable gift denominated common sense, it is little better than a work of supererogation to go about to prove that those who enslave the body will not care much for the soul. If a man "love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" If he can disregard the claims of his brother, why should he regard those of his God? In spite, however, of the obvious incongruity of slavery with the instruction of the slaves, either mentally or morally, the impression has been made by those who would put off the day of release, that the slaves *are* the objects of a religious culture, which is *preparing* them, both for freedom in this world, and happiness in the next. The testimony of Mr. Seabrook, is well fitted to dispel any such delusion. He examines three plans, for the religious instruction of slaves, which have been recently put forth. 1. That of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia. 2. That of a writer in the Gospel Messenger; and, 3. That contained in the pamphlet of Mr. Clay, which we have been examining. What amount of instruction do these plans contemplate? The synod propose "to preach the gospel to *servants*," to establish "schools, daily or weekly, for negro children," and, "to conduct the labor and discipline of the plantation on *gospel principles.*" The plan of the Gospel Messenger, recommends for the imitation of slaveholders, the example of Abraham, whose whole household, as well as his children, were under religious instruction. Mr. Clay recommends preaching, sabbath schools, and evening meetings to be conducted by slaveholders themselves. None of these plans contemplate any other than **ORAL** instruction.

They propose no assemblies except under the eye of the master, and no instruction except with his express approbation. That dangerous invention, the alphabet, has no place in either of them. Yet Mr. Seabrook, in opposing all these plans, proceeds upon the ground that they are *dangerous innovations*!—unheard-of infringements of the peculiar institutions of the south!—extravagant stretches of liberality to the lower caste!—and of direct *revolutionary tendency*! Does the sun shine where this champion of darkness predicts the ruinous consequences of admitting a few rays of *reflected light*?*

Mr. Seabrook himself does not “deny the importance of religious instruction to slaves.” But he would have it only in the *day time*, and confine it to those “prominent portions of Scripture which show the duties of servants and the *rights of masters*”! And he is very solicitous, that the *fear of God* should not be substituted for the *fear of man*. “I would also add,” says he, “that the *fears* of the negro ought seldom to be appealed to by the clergyman; a merciful Savior, and not a revengeful God, should, in the main be presented to his mind. Speak to him *mildly* as a human being liable to error, and *persuade* him to approach nearer to the throne of Jehovah by obeying those few and simple laws, a belief in which, we are taught, is essential to future happiness. If by word or manner he is inspired with *terror*, you may make him a madman, but never a Christian.” If Mr. Seabrook is taught that God does not rule by terror, let us digress to ask, why does not he change his system and act upon God’s plan? Why do his *drivers* frighten his *slaves* with threats of those horrible stocks?—The truth is, that slaveholders generally, are unwilling that Christianity should be taught to their slaves, any further than they can make a tool of it to serve their own purposes; and as it is a two-edged tool, they are mostly afraid to meddle with it at all. They complain that it has too little respect of persons

* Mr. Clay, it is true, recommends that the plantation schools for children should imitate as “*nearly as the nature of the case will permit*,” the method of instruction pursued in infant schools. “Hymns, scripture cards, the commandments, parables, and other select portions of Scripture—especially such texts as reprove their prevailing faults, are the most suitable lessons.” From this it must not be understood that the cards, glaring with the “incendiary” A. B. C. are put in the hands of the *children*. The teacher delivers them ORALLY. This is as near to the practice of freedom, “as the nature of the case will permit.”

to suit their "peculiar" state of society. "Is it wise," asks Mr. Seabrook, "on *any* occasion, to act as though the population of South Carolina were homogeneous? If our institutions, require, that a portion of the people of the state should be treated *in every place and at all times* as a subordinate caste, by what authority, human or divine, does the citizen violate that obligation. Need I say the experience of the world attests, that the battle of the cross can nowhere be successfully waged, unless the laws of the land and *the established usages of society are faithfully cherished and supported.*" We cannot believe that Mr. Seabrook would have hazarded this assertion, if the "experience" of southern Christianity, as cherishing and supporting the "usages of society" there, had not fully borne him out in it.

The Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, in effect, confess that southern Christianity has supported slavery to the almost total neglect of the souls of the slaves. Here is the hideous picture which they draw of the *moral influence* of slavery.

"The influence of the negroes upon the moral and religious interests of the whites is destructive in the extreme. We cannot go into special detail. It is unnecessary. We make our appeal to universal experience. We are chained to a putrid carcase! It sickens and destroys us. We have a millstone hanging about the neck of our society, to sink us deep in the sea of vice. Our children are corrupting from their infancy, nor can we prevent it. Many an anxious parent, like the missionary in foreign lands, wishes that his children could be brought beyond the reach of the corrupting influence of the *depraved heathen*. Nor is this influence confined to mere childhood. If that were all it would be tremendous. But it follows into youth, into manhood, and in old age. And when we come directly into contact with their depravity in the management of them, then come temptations, and provocations, and trials that unsearchable grace only can enable us to endure. In all our intercourse with them, we are undergoing a process of intellectual and moral deterioration; and it requires almost superhuman effort to maintain a high standing either for intelligence or piety."

This, too, is the testimony of slaveholders, who abjure with horror all sentiments of abolitionary tendency. While Mr. Seabrook discards the "necessity" of presenting such a picture, it meets from him a very slender denial. "Where," he exclaims, "was the necessity for this fancy sketch, as *I hold it to be?* Does it not leave room for suspicion, admitting the soundness of the report on the matter under review, that the committee would prepare the way for what *ought* to happen?" But the Synod were unwilling witnesses. They testified to their own neglect of duty. They were

driven out by the spirit of an advancing age. Driven, not to the extent of advocating instruction as a preparative to emancipation, but at the risk of such a possible result. "In *rebutting*," says Mr. S. "the argument, that the end of religious instruction will be emancipation, the committee [of the synod] exclaim, '*Come what may*, as Christians, we have no alternative. If we obey God our Savior, we must preach the gospel to servants.' *This is an unfortunate declaration.* Its inevitable effect will be to invalidate the *opinions* and *principles* which the authors of the Report so ably vindicate." But what are these "opinions and principles"? Assuredly those which support the *right* of the planters to their human chattels—the *right* of the south to its "peculiar domestic policy." The Synod are at special pains to vindicate themselves from all "foreign interference." Have we not a claim then upon the Synod as pro-slavery witnesses?—The very pains taken by Mr. Seabrook to *prove* them in favor of abolition, shows strikingly the value of their testimony to us, as well as the exorbitant tyranny of slavery. It may not be unedifying to look at another of his arguments.

"From the spirit and tenor of the pamphlet, as well as from matters *needlessly introduced*, I deduce the inference, that, in the estimation of the Synod, slavery is unlawful. Considering the command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," as authority sufficient for us to bestow the gift of God, upon every one who does not possess it, *under of course the limitations and restrictions imposed by society*, the impropriety of the following quotations and comments will readily be perceived:—'God hath made of one blood all the nations of men.' 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' 'The negroes are our neighbors, for they are men, members of the same great family. If they are not our neighbors, whom we are bound to love, we have no neighbors at all.' 'All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them'! 'God is no respecter of persons'! It is true the committee say, that 'this rule of action, does not recklessly break down *just* distinctions in society,' but it is equally true, that the sentences quoted contain the foundation argument on which the emancipationist proposes to erect the superstructure of his scheme."

Hence *we* "deduce the inference," that the Synod of South Carolina, are to be quoted not only as pro-slavery, but as pro-slavery in spite of divine truth, so powerful that an ordinary slaveholder shrinks back from it as dangerous and incendiary. With scripture condemnation on their tongues, they dare to defend "southern institutions." The reader may, therefore, turn back to their picture of the moral influence of slavery, with the absolute conviction that it is light and fair compared with the actual state of *facts*.

The lights that have been kindled up in southern gloom, by Messrs. Jones, Clay and others, and which serve to make darkness visible, are treated by Mr. Seabrook with the most bitter contempt, and from the tone and temper of his remarks, we may infer that they are regarded by the mass of slaveholders, not only as innovations, but as attacks upon their *right of property*. One or two quotations will be sufficient to make us understood :—

“That the slaveholder and his family should officiate as teachers to their own people is so palpably objectionable, if it were practicable, in every light in which the suggestion can be viewed, that I need only observe, when the scene shall be exhibited of the people of South Carolina, tri-daily, according to Mr. Clay, or weekly, as recommended by the committee, “reading and explaining the Bible, and conversing with their servants on the subject of the soul’s immortality,” the reign of fanaticism and misrule will have commenced.”

—“I object totally, however, for the general reasons already advanced, and for others that will readily suggest themselves, to “the preacher adapting a part of every sermon to their intellectual wants,” or, “to the giving out one or two lines of a hymn, that they may join in the exercises.” This is a device of the levelers, and too heterodox for the present state of *public opinion*.”

“Another mode of communicating religious information to slaves, upon which Mr. Clay comments, is, what he terms, domestic, to be conducted by the resident planter and his family. This mode must have been suggested to Mr. Clay by a Tappanist. If friendly to the policy and perpetuity of our institutions, it could not have been the fruit of his own reflections.”

These quotations we make with no reference to the feasibility of the various plans of *oral* religious instruction, but to show the present actual condition of the slaves, in regard to a knowledge of those truths, which are essential to human salvation. We think we have proved that slaveholders, as a mass, are guilty of the *wilful murder of the souls* on which they have laid their unhallowed hands. That nothing like a serious effort has ever been made, by any considerable body of slaveholders, for the instruction and salvation of the slaves—and that the slaveholders generally are determined it NEVER SHALL BE MADE.

In conclusion, we hardly need remark, that when abolitionists assert that the slaves are defrauded of their wages, driven with the whip, over-worked, under-fed, cruelly and arbitrarily punished, sunk in brutal ignorance, and thrust away from the words of eternal life, they assert only what is admitted by the defenders of slavery themselves. The facts which they detail, as naturally flow from the causes which the slaveholders avow, and in which they glory, as ice collects about the pole, or darkness ensues the absence of the sun.

THE AGRICULTURAL CODE OF ST. DOMINGO.

From the testimony of T. F. Buxton, Esq. before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to inquire into the laws and usages of the several West India Colonies, in relation to the slave population. 1832.

AN important question here arises,—What were the measures taken after emancipation, to secure tranquillity and order, and to rescue the planters and slaves from ruin? One of the first steps was to draw up a code of rules, to be observed upon the plantations. The rules were printed and made public; they were also ordered to be read aloud to all the negroes, in their own dialect, upon every estate, at short and fixed periods. The preamble to these regulations, while it proclaimed freedom to all, insisted upon the necessity of industry in all, without which every thing would go to ruin.

These rules underwent modification from time to time; but their general object was to prevent oppression on the part of the master, and to secure good order, and to stimulate industry on the part of the laborer:—They took away from the master the use of the whip and of the chain, and of every other instrument of correction, either by himself or his authority; in short all power of arbitrary punishment, under severe penalties. On the other hand, that a just subordination might be maintained, all laborers offending against the established rules, or not performing their contracts, were to be brought before a magistrate, who should examine the case and decide it according to fixed principles.

On this part of the subject, happily, great aid may be derived from papers already on the table of Parliament, more particularly the report of Mr. Consul-General Mackenzie, (No. 18, of 1829,) and that of Major Moody, (No. 81, of 1826.) In the documents contained in those two reports, unsophisticated by the comments either of the Consul-General or of the Commissioner, ample and satisfactory information on this subject will be found.

The earliest Agricultural Code, in point of date, will be found in Mr. Mackenzie's Report, p. 111—117. It was issued by the Commissioner Polverel, on the 28th of February, 1794, and was intended to carry into full and extended effect, the regulations he had previously enjoined in three different ordinances, issued by him on the 27th of August,

and 21st of October, 1793, and on the 7th of February, 1794. Unfortunately, Mr. Mackenzie has not given these previous regulations, and we only know of them by their being referred to in the final ordinance of the 28th of February, as having fixed the relative proportions of produce which the laborers contracting to work for shares were to receive, as well as the laborers by the year or by the day.

As the ordinance of the 28th of February, 1794, is the basis of all the subsequent codes of agriculture which have been adopted in St. Domingo, it is important to understand its nature. It will be found at full length in Mr. Mackenzie's Report; but, considering its bearing on the present inquiry, an abstract of it, which may be easily verified by a reference to the report itself, may be of use.

The ordinance is entitled "Regulations of Police, respecting Cultivation and Cultivators," and is said to be issued by "Etienne Polverel, Civil Commissary of the Republic, delegated to the French islands, for the purpose of re-establishing the public order and tranquillity." It is prefaced by the following observations.

"The enfranchisement of the Africans has produced in St. Domingo a mode of cultivation unknown in France, and of which, even in the Colonies, they have not hitherto suspected the possibility. Agriculture, in France, furnishes only raw products. Each of its establishments requires few hands and few implements of tillage, and has nothing in common with manufactories designed to increase the value of the raw material.

"In the colonies, moreover, they have hitherto only known cultivation by slaves. *A whip set in motion by the will of the master, has impelled the movements of the whole establishment.* The establishments are both agricultural and manufacturing. They not only produce the raw materials, but they give to them form and value. One family, therefore, does not suffice, as in France, to form an establishment.

"Each establishment contains a numerous population, sometimes exceeding that of small towns and villages in Europe; *and it is on free hands, and voluntary labor, that these important establishments will henceforward have to depend for their existence and activity.*

"Since the abolition of fiefs and tithes, few rural laws

are needed in France ; she has probably at present all that are necessary ; and in the colonies, *while there were only masters and slaves, none were required.*

“ But to give a uniform direction to large bodies, who require to be guided, *but whom no power has a right to compel ; to induce them to concur freely to the same end ; to maintain peace and order among them ; to prevent the abuse of liberty, and to protect effectually the rights of property and the productions of industry ; powerfully to excite that industry, and to make the general prosperity the result of the greatest gain of each individual ;—to effect all this there must be rural laws ; appropriate to the local circumstances ; to the nature of the climate and its productions ; to the mode of culture which these require, and to the civil and political condition, and to the manners and character of the cultivators.*

“ May the ready concurrence of the cultivators render unnecessary the greater part of the rules of this ordinance, that there may no longer exist in the colonies but two classes of cultivators—proprietors of the soil, and cultivators sharing with them in the products of cultivation ! *This seems the only means of insuring large incomes to the proprietors, and freedom and comfort to the laborers ; of preserving the public peace and order, and of maintaining liberty and equality forever.*

“ The cultivator who does not share in the fruit of his labor, is always looking for the largest wages and the least work ; while the sole interest of the laborer who shares the produce is to increase that produce, and consequently to augment his own receipts and the proprietor's income ; and as to the cultivator on these terms, he need not be disturbed respecting the future ; the products of the soil must first provide the means of his subsistence and clothing, even when he shall be unfitted for labor by age or infirmity.

“ *The cultivator, therefore, who shares in the produce, is absolutely independent of the proprietor ; he is his equal, in all the force of that term.*

“ Of all the methods of proceeding which can be adopted for the cultivation of the colonies, the association of the cultivators with the proprietors, on the principle of sharing in the products of the soil, is that which unites the greatest advantages both for the one and the other. It makes a re-

turn to the former slavery forever impossible ; it establishes an equality to the greatest extent which is attainable among a civilized people ; and it gives to all classes an equal interest in respecting and protecting property, and in multiplying the products of the soil."

The regulations which follow are divided into six heads :

"1. Condition of the people ; 2. Of cultivators generally ; 3. Of cultivators sharing in the produce (cultivateurs portionnaires) ; 4. Of cultivators for daily hire ; 5. Of cultivators by the month, or for a longer period ; and, 6. General regulations." The following is a brief abstract of them.

I. There are not, and will not henceforward be, in St. Domingo, any more than in France, any but free persons. Every individual may contract with another for his time and labor, but he can neither sell himself, nor be sold. The property in his person is inalienable. The French republic admits not of slavery. The rights of men are equality, liberty, safety, property. In the present ordinance, man is considered only in his agricultural relations. He is either a proprietor of the soil, or a cultivator of that which belongs to another. *Here* I only distinguish these two classes, the present ordinance being for them alone. But, neither from this, nor from any other distinction, can any inequality arise among men in respect to civil and political rights ; they are all equal in the eyes of the law, as they are by nature. But, besides the general laws which unite and protect all citizens, there exist peculiar relations between the proprietors of the soil, and the cultivators of it ; and it is to these relations alone that the following rules apply.

II. The cultivators of another person's estate are divided into three classes ;—those who share in the produce, those who are hired by the year or the month, and those who are hired by the day.

III. In respect of cultivators for shares of the produce, the ordinary day's labor is limited to about nine hours, viz :—from sunrise to half past eight ; from half past nine to twelve ; and from two till sunset ; and in crop time it shall be extended to eight o'clock in the evening. The manager (econome-gerant) of each plantation shall keep an exact account of the days, and hours of the day, in which the laborers or any part of them shall have been absent from their work, and shall specify the names of the defaulters, and the

time of their absence; and that time being estimated at three livres a day for each man, and two livres a day for each woman, and proportionably for the hours of absence, the amount, at each distribution of the revenue of the plantation, shall be deducted from the shares of the defaulters, and added to those of the proprietor, the manager, the overseers (conducteurs,) and the other laborers, *not* defaulters, in the proportions prescribed in the proclamation of the 31st of October, 1793, and in the 30th and 31st articles of the regulations of the 7th instant. [These are, unfortunately, wanting.] And if the manager omit to record defaulters, the amount of such defaults, and an equal amount deducted from the share of the manager, shall be distributed in like manner between the proprietor, the overseers and the cultivators, *not* in default. In cases of extraordinary urgency arising from the state of the crops, certain prescribed measures may be taken for extending the period of labor during the night beyond the customary hours, so as to prevent loss to all parties. The overseers shall alone order and direct the labors of the young. They alone shall be charged with executing the instructions of those who administer the affairs of the estate, directing and superintending the labors at all times, both out of crop and in crop time. The laborers shall be bound to obey the overseer, and the overseers to obey each other according to their rank; but their authority shall be confined to the cultivation and good order of the plantation. Those laborers who in these points shall formally refuse to obey the orders of the overseers, shall be subject to a month's imprisonment, with labor during the day on public works, and shall be deprived during that time of their share of the produce. An inferior overseer disobeying his superior shall be punished in like manner for two months. If, to insubordination, menaces and an attempt to strike be added, the penalty may be extended to six months in case of laborers, and to twelve months in case of sub-overseers, who shall also be made incapable of again exercising any authority. If the superior should be struck by the inferior, the latter shall be excluded from any association of laborers working for shares, and shall be subject to trial by the penal code. If the majority of the laborers should be guilty of acts of insubordination, besides being punished individually, they

shall be forced to quit the plantation, the proprietor being at liberty to replace them by other cultivators. If, on the other hand, an *overseer shall strike one who is under him*, or shall place him, *by his own authority*, under restraint or in prison, he shall be deprived of his office, and declared incapable of directing freemen; and if blood-shed, or any grave injury should follow, he shall be tried and punished according to the penal code. This rule applies to all men, women, and children. In case of quarrels, threats and acts of violence among the cultivators, the overseers shall place the parties under arrest, and endeavor to reconcile them; and the aggressors shall be confined to their houses for three successive Sundays. If the violence or threats are used towards women, or aged or infirm persons, the person guilty shall be punished further with a fine of half his share of the produce of the plantation; and if the offence be repeated, he shall be turned off the plantation, and excluded from all other associations laboring for shares.

A number of rules are then prescribed for punishing by pecuniary penalties, the theft, or the appropriation of the common property of the plantation for private ends, by either the proprietor, the manager, the overseers, or the cultivators for shares. If the delinquents are unable to pay the fine, they shall be imprisoned and employed on the public works, at daily wages, till the amount is paid. The same rules apply to portioning the property of individuals. The repetition of the offence shall be punished by being turned off the plantation, and being declared unworthy to be admitted into any similar association. Any voluntary injury done to the property or the animals on the plantation, shall be punished in the same manner. Strict rules are also laid down as to damages done by pigs, &c.; also for the due care and distribution of water, whether for common use, or for turning mills, or for irrigation, with suitable penalties for neglect or transgression.

Every manager neglecting to keep in due form the prescribed registers, or who shall *correct or strike* any overseer or cultivator, or *who shall cause any other person to do so*, shall be deprived of his office, and rendered incapable of filling such office in future. Every manager who appropriates to himself any part of the money deposited in the common chest shall be punished in like manner, besides

paying double the sum subtracted. The manager, however, shall be protected from all menace or violence.

No cultivator, working for a share of the produce, can be deprived of his rights during the year for which he has contracted, except in the cases expressly mentioned above. A cultivator quitting the plantation during the year, must find a substitute approved by his fellow laborers; and if he intends quitting it at the end of the year, he must give two months notice, under penalty. A cultivator cannot be excluded at the end of the year but only by a vote of the majority of the cultivators, of which he shall have two months notice. An establishment for cultivating by shares, can only be broken up when a majority of the cultivators refuse to perform their contract, or when it is found necessary to expel the cultivators for insubordination, or when they are reduced to less than half their number by death, weakness, voluntary retirement, or forcible removal. In these cases the proprietor may form a new association of cultivators for shares, or employ laborers for him by the day or the year; but he cannot even then turn off the old, the young, or the infirm. If, however, the association, though reduced, shall be able two months before the close of the year, to recruit to three fourths of their complement, the proprietor shall not be at liberty to discontinue the establishment. Whenever the reduced state of the establishment, or the urgency of the season, puts in peril a part of the crop, or renders it difficult to prepare for the future crop, the proprietor may strengthen the establishment by such number of day laborers as he shall judge necessary, the cost of such hired labor being charged to the common fund, and being first paid out of the proceeds of the plantation. Every other cause of difference or quarrel between proprietors and cultivators than those hereinbefore regulated, shall be settled by the course of law common to all citizens; all, whether proprietors or cultivators, being in every other respect on a footing of equality.

IV. The rules with respect to laborers by the day, as to periods of labor, submission to the overseers, peaceableness of demeanor, protection from violence, &c. are the same as in the preceding chapter; their offences being punishable by dismissal and loss of wages. They are not, however, to have overseers (*conducteurs*) of *their own choice*, as is

the case with laborers for shares, but are to submit to the overseers already chosen by such.* Work from sunset to sunrise, when required, shall be paid for at the rate of half an escalin (a ninth of a dollar) an hour in the case of men, or in the case of women a third of an escalin.

V. The hire for field work of laborers hired by the month or longer, is fixed, for men above eighteen, at four dollars; for women, at two dollars and a half; and for persons from fourteen to eighteen, at two dollars; to be paid at the end of the month. If they quit before the end of the term, they shall forfeit the wages due; if they are dismissed before the term, they shall be paid for all the time that is to run. The hire of mechanics and artizans shall be settled by special contract.

VI. The justices of the peace and their assessors, shall have jurisdiction in all matters comprised in this ordinance; and where none have been yet appointed, the jurisdiction shall belong to the military commandant, and to one or other of them in all cases of accusation, arrest, and prosecution, the necessary papers and proofs shall be sent.

The present ordinance shall be printed, published on three successive Sundays in a loud and intelligible voice, and explained in the Creole dialect during the hours of market, and in the market place of the chief place of each parish, and posted up in all conspicuous and frequented places, and at the chief dwelling houses of plantations. It shall also be duly registered in all superior as well as inferior courts, and sent to all the principal officers, civil and military, who are all made responsible for its due execution.

The above ordinance of Polverel appears to have been in full force from the time of its promulgation, 28th February, 1794, until the beginning of August, 1798. During that interval Toussaint L'Ouverture had risen to the chief command; and it is of this period that Colonel Malenfant, in a passage already cited, speaks, when he says "*The colony flourished under Toussaint. The whites lived happily and in peace upon their estates, and the negroes continued to work for them.*" This statement, as has also been shown, was fully confirmed by General La Croix, who, as well as

* What resemblance can possibly exist between the conducteur of Hayti and the driver of Jamaica, the former being thus chosen by the laborers, to guide their labors and protect their interests?

Colonel Malenfant, served in St. Domingo at the time. His words are, that the Commissioner Santhonax, who had been recalled to France, on returning to the colony in 1796 "was astonished at the state in which he found it." "This," he adds, "was owing to Toussaint, who, while he had succeeded in establishing order and discipline among the black troops, had succeeded also in making the black laborers return to the plantations, there to resume cultivation." In the next year, 1797, the same author tells us that the colony was marching "as by enchantment, towards its ancient splendor; cultivation prospered, every day produced perceptible proofs of its progress." The testimony of General Vincent, another eye-witness, is to the same effect.

The war, which had been waged by England in St. Domingo with such disastrous expense of blood and treasure, for the purpose of restoring slavery, and which must have extensively interfered with the progress of cultivation, was brought to a close at this time by a convention between Toussaint and the English General Maitland, leaving Toussaint in possession of the whole island. To repress the disorders to which warfare had necessarily given birth, and to give a renewed impulse to cultivation, a fresh ordinance was issued on the 3d of August, 1798, accompanied by an urgent call on all public functionaries to exert themselves in giving it effect. "In St. Domingo, as in France," says this address, "Royalists and Anarchists see with dismay the establishment of constitutional order; and, with a view to disturb the peace of the colony, try all means of impeding the progress of cultivation. 'Let us persuade the cultivators,' they say, 'that liberty consists in doing no work; and if we succeed, we shall certainly restore slavery, since the colony, yielding no resource, will be abandoned by the mother country.' But no, the true friends of liberty will make the cultivators sensible that labor alone can render them happy, both by procuring for them in abundance the means of providing for the wants of their families, and by raising the colony to the degree of splendor to which it ought to aspire."

The ordinance itself, which will be found at page 95 of Mr. Mackenzie's report, premises that since agriculture is the foundation of prosperity to a state; that since in order to make agriculture flourish, all possible means must be

adopted for assuring to the cultivators the fruit of their toils ; that since cultivators and proprietors are authorized to enter into mutual contracts for a limited time ; that since, by means of a good police, the colonial cultivators may attain to a still greater degree of comfort than those of France ; and, finally, that since the industrious will derive less from their exertions, if their brethren of the same establishment are permitted to live in idleness and vagrancy ; therefore these further resolutions are issued. The regulations spoken of refer to the division of the produce between the cultivators and the proprietor. The cultivators are to enjoy a fourth of the revenue of the plantation, from which no deduction shall be made on any pretext, either for expenses or taxes ; and till this fourth is paid, the proprietor can dispose of no part of the proceeds of the estate ; the share of the cultivators also being conveyed by him to the nearest place of shipment. Besides this, the cultivators shall have adequate provision grounds allotted to each family of them, and shall have medical attendance and medicine at the proprietor's expense. Proprietors, or managers, are bound to act as fathers of families towards the cultivators, and *to induce them to form legitimate marriages*, by making them sensible that such unions "are the best means of securing to themselves the enjoyment of all social blessings ; of obtaining consolation, care, and assistance in sorrow and sickness ; of promoting that purity of manners which is so essential to happiness and health ; of rapidly increasing population ; and of extending cultivation and augmenting its products." The hours of labor vary a little from the former regulation of Poverel. They extend from day-dawn to eleven of the forenoon, with an interval for breakfast, and from two until dusk in the afternoon, the mid-day interval extending to three hours. An exact account is to be kept of the days and hours of attendance of every cultivator, with a view of regulating accordingly the distribution of shares. The term of contracts for labor is extended from one to three years, and they are to be registered gratis by the justices of the peace or the municipal officers ; and a year's notice must be given, mutually by the proprietor and cultivator, of the intention to dissolve the contract. Penalties are annexed for violating such contracts, and for causing tumults or disturbances on the plantations, consisting of pecuniary fines,

imprisonment, and labor on the public works. The commandants of quarters are to superintend the police, and maintain order on the plantations. The managers of estates shall have power to give leave of absence to the cultivator, only to the extent of the arrondissement in which the plantation is situated. Beyond that they must have passports from the constituted authorities. Every month these regulations must be read on the plantations, and they must be printed and published, and fixed up in the conspicuous places, and sent to all the authorities, civil and military, who are held responsible for their execution.

These regulations on the subject of cultivation, the work of Toussaint, but differing little, either in their principles or details, from those of Polverel already abstracted, appear to have continued in force from August, 1798, until the arrival of the French army in St. Domingo, in February, 1802. Toussaint indeed, on the 2d of July, 1801, gave a new constitution to St. Domingo, intended to prevent the restoration of slavery, and which he employed General Vincent to convey to Bonaparte, but he made no change in the regulations respecting agriculture—a presumption that he deemed them adequate to their purpose.—(*See Report of the Lords' Com. pp. 843—847.*)

A REVIEW.—THE ELEMENTS OF MORAL SCIENCE.

BY THE EDITOR.

The Elements of Moral Science. By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D. D. Second Edition. Cooke & Co. New-York, 1835.—1 Vol. 8vo. pp. 448.

HE who sees the machinery of a manufactory in the full whirl of successful operation, cannot doubt that every part is adapted to fulfil a certain appropriate office in subserviency to the ruling design on which the whole was constructed. That design may, or may not, have been the best possible. But for any wheel to cease its motion in harmony with the system to which it belongs, and move in conformity to the design of even a more productive system, of which in a supposable case, it might form a part, would be a fault. So, the existing universe, for aught we know, might have been

conformed to a design productive, when carried into full operation, of a greater amount of happiness; but for any member of the present universe to act in reference to a supposed greatest possible amount of happiness, rather than in reference to the will of his Creator, as indicated in his own constitution, is no less absurd than the independent motion of the over-wise wheel. Again, on the supposition that the present universe *is* adapted to produce the greatest possible amount of happiness, and that *for this reason* its members are bound to fulfil their parts in conformity with the design of the whole, the *plan* is exalted in authority above the *planner*. The Creator is made the slave of an abstract end, from which he could not have deviated, on pain of forfeiting the allegiance of his own creatures—a palpable absurdity. Hence the only right theory of moral obligation is that which refers it directly to the WILL OF THE CREATOR, and not to an end which He may, or may not, have had in view in the creation. And hence, too, it is absurd to suppose that we derive our notion of the moral quality of actions, from a notion of their tendency to the greatest happiness or otherwise. If the reason of our moral obligation lies in the will of God, our sense of that obligation cannot spring from the perception of an end which He may, or may not, have willed. The verdict of common sense is clear on this point. The parent expects obedience from his child, as the result of a spontaneous sense of obligation, not of a calculation of consequences. The whole government of the parent proceeds upon the supposition of a constitutional moral sense in the child. Otherwise it would be tyrannical, if not absurd, for the parent to exercise authority, till the child should be able fully to comprehend his plans and reasons.

Constituted as things are. it is demonstrably certain that the greatest happiness of any individual must lie in obedience to the will of God—otherwise God has adapted his plan to frustrate his own will, having introduced a preponderance of motive to that effect. But to say that the happiness of the individual, or of the community, is the ground of obligation to obey God, is to shut out God from his own universe, or if not to shut Him out, it is to make Him, in spite of his glorious and incomparable nature, a mere unit among the works of his own hands—‘altogether such a one

as ourselves.' If we may reverently use such language, it is the **HAPPINESS OF GOD** which imposes moral obligation, but how is His happiness, whatever may be said of its absolute perfection, to be distinguished from the gratification of His will—or His "good pleasure"?

But of what use, it will be asked, is this disquisition concerning the ground of moral obligation, and the existence of conscience? Paley, and his school of patch-work philosophers, deny its use altogether. The former treats the will of God, the public good, &c. as synonymous. He throws all the supposed grounds of obligation into his grand crucible for confounding distinctions, and melts them into a homogeneous mass—the result is, that moral obligation is nothing but a "*violent motive*"! The existence of conscience is with him a question of mere curiosity! And by this process the morals of the age have been unhinged—never to be restored till eternal truth is emancipated from the bondage of "circumstances," and the constitution of man is reinstated in the importance which God gave it. We are among the number, increasing if not large, who believe that no infidel has done more to poison the public morals of any age, than Archdeacon Paley. And it is just here that his venom lurks. His precepts are mostly good. He teaches *generally* according to the dictates of conscience, yet in discarding that monitor, his right maxims become doubtful and powerless—ever ready to "bend to circumstances," and his philosophy, thus set afloat, first exemplified its tendency to error in some mischievous instances in his own book. Although the subjects of Dr. Paley's delusion may be slow to see it, we are not backward to assert our belief, that the prevalence of his system of ethics is the principal reason why, among Christians, the educated class are more averse than others to any attempt at a general reformation of morals. They have been taught to regard man as a mere creature of circumstances. They have lost sight of the fundamental and eternal principles of his constitution. In making up their decisions on great moral questions, they do not bring home the facts of the issue to their own bosoms, and take the verdict which God utters there, through the 'still small voice.' Their inquiry is, What does the public good require; and they take the answer of public opinion!

The plain unsophisticated man, when certain facts are before him, feels that it would be an outrage upon his moral nature not to decide instantly. From that moment he is ready for action—his weight is all in one scale.

Again, Dr. Paley undermines the authority of that very standard of morals which he professes to regard—the Scriptures. If man have not a moral sense, what is a revelation of morals to him, more than a landscape to the blind? Man, by a clear inference from Dr. Paley's premises, is constitutionally incapable of receiving a revelation of moral truths, and will inevitably pervert one to serve his own lusts. The Bible came not because the human constitution—the image of God—was defective, but because it was abused by sin. It appeals to the conscience. If there be no such thing as conscience, it is a dead letter; but if there be, then any system of morals which modifies the maxims of the sacred book by the glosses of expediency, overthrows the authority of that book. Prove that it sanctions falsehood, licentiousness, or slavery, and you give it a fatal stab. Prove that it temporizes in regard to any iniquity, maintaining an artful silence for the sake of avoiding persecution or gaining time, and you have done the work no less effectually. The book professes open truth and fearless honesty—just as such a book ought—but if the averments of the expediency school are true, it is guilty of foul hypocrisy,* and must necessarily be rejected.

After the energies of religion and humanity have been so long spell bound under this tyrannous system, it is truly refreshing to feel that the fetters are giving way. We refer with delight to the work placed at the head of this article, to extract from which, rather than to express our own thoughts, was the purpose with which we took up the pen.

Whatever fault may be found with Dr. Wayland for occasional obscurity of style, we think those whose duty it is to teach the elements of moral science, will not fail to admire and be grateful for the scientific and luminous order in which he has treated the subject. Still higher will be the cause of gratitude on the part of the pupils, who will certainly rise from their study with sentiments far more in conformity with the relations of rational and immortal beings,

* See Dr. Paley's chapter on Slavery.

than if they had sat down to the shallow and flippant pages of Paley. Dr. Wayland has built upon the rock. He proceeds upon the eternal distinction between right and wrong, as created by the will of the unchangeable God. He clothes man with constitutional attributes to recognize this distinction. There is an impressiveness and authority in the whole work which illustrates the language of God to his prophet, "If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth." Before such a work we hope to see some of the idolized sophisms of the age speedily dislodged.

One of these sophisms lies in confounding the nature of an action with the character of the actor. Denounce slavery as a violation, in all circumstances, of the eternal rule of right, and you are referred to the good character of *some* slaveholders. You are shown the circumstances which create a presumption that their motives are pure. You are told that they make it a matter of conscience to hold slaves, hence they do *right*, and slavery cannot be always wrong. Here the right or wrong of slavery is confounded with the guilt or innocence of slaveholders. The following remarks of Dr. Wayland, we think draw a just distinction.

"It is well known, that the repetition of wickedness produces great stupidity of conscience, or, as it is frequently termed hardness of heart. But, no one ever considers this stupidity as, in any manner, an excuse. It is, on the contrary, always held to be an aggravation of crime. Thus we term a man, who has become so accustomed to crime, that he will murder without feeling and without regret, a *remorseless* murderer, a *cold-blooded* assassin; and, every one knows, that, by these epithets, we mean to designate a special and additional element of guiltiness. This I take to be the universal feeling of man.

"The assertion to the contrary, would lead to results manifestly erroneous.

"Suppose two men of precisely the same moral attainments to day, to commence, at the same time two courses of conduct diametrically opposed to each other. The first by the scrupulous doing of right, cultivates, to the utmost, his moral nature, and increases, with every day, his capacity for virtue. The sphere of his benevolent affections enlarges, and the play of his moral feelings becomes more and more intense, until he is filled with the most ardent desire to promote the welfare of every fellow creature, and to do the will of God with his whole heart. The other, by a continued course of crime, gradually destroys the susceptibility of conscience, and lessens his capacity for virtue, until his soul is filled with hatred to God, and no other feeling of obligation remains, except that of fidelity to his co-partners in guilt.

"Now, at the expiration of this period, if both of these men should act according to what each felt to be the dictate of conscience, they would act very differently. But, if a man can be under obligation to do and to leave undone, nothing but what his conscience, at a particular moment, indicates, I do not see but that these men would be, *in the actions of that moment*, equally innocent. The only difference between them, so far as the actions of a particular moment were concerned, would be the difference between a virtuous man and a virtuous child.

"From these facts, we are easily led to the distinction between right and wrong, and innocence and guilt. Right and wrong depend upon the relations

under which beings are created; and, hence, the obligations resulting from these relations are, in their nature, fixed and unchangeable. Guilt and innocence depend upon the knowledge of these relations; and are, moreover, affected by the degree in which the imperfection of conscience is the result of the voluntary agency of the individual himself. As these are manifestly susceptible of variation, while right and wrong are invariable, the two notions may manifestly not always correspond to each other." P. 81.

We need not stop to inquire, how far the innocence of any slaveholders may, in matter of fact, be established on these principles. It is sufficient, that the justification of slavery itself, which is thus attempted by its apologists, is a non sequitur from their premises. We are not called upon to sit in judgment upon the souls of slaveholders, any more than of other sinners, but their slaveholding we are bound to condemn as sin,—sin in its nature, apart from the motives of the sinner. At the same time, too, it becomes us to warn those who hold human beings as property, in the language of Dr. Wayland, that "our own consciousness of innocence, or our not being conscious of guilt, is by no means a sufficient proof of our innocence. A man may never have reflected on the relations in which he stands to other men, or to God; and, hence, may be conscious of no feeling of obligation toward either, in any or in particular respects. This may be the fact; but his innocence would not be established, unless he can also show, that he has faithfully and impartially used all the powers, which God has given him, to obtain a knowledge of these relations. Or, again, he may understand the relation, and have no corresponding sensibility. This may be the fact; but his innocency would not be established, unless he can also show that he has always faithfully and honestly obeyed his conscience, so that his moral insensibility is, in no manner, attributable to his own acts."

Another sophism of the age regards the doctrine of "consequences." For example, it is said, "if the consequences of an abolition of slavery would be worse than its continuance, slavery ought not to be abolished." This doctrine is brought to hold abolitionists at bay till they can show that certain terrible consequences would *not* flow from the measure they advocate. And because they rush on heedless of *these* consequences, they are accused of having *no regard to consequences* in making up their decisions of duty! But the truth is, they *have* weighed the consequences, and all

the consequences, so far as experience has taught them, of *slavery*, and the result is, a conviction that slavery is sinful—that it is contrary to the will of God. The maxim that requires them to weigh consequences further, in order to decide the duty of abolition, they pronounce a sophism, because, if such inquiry should result against abolition, it would make the will of God contrary to itself. If an instance of emancipation had never taken place, the known consequences of slavery would make the will of God respecting it absolutely certain. To inquire further would be to trifle with God. Again, if, after having satisfactorily settled the sinfulness of slavery from its own appropriate consequences, we may proceed to modify that decision by a regard to the consequences of its abolition, we may also proceed to commit any other sin, and then justify its continuance from the supposed consequences of its cessation.

Abolitionists by no means reject the light which nature throws upon slavery. And in using that light, in connection with the light which God has placed within, they proceed on the principles thus happily laid down by Dr. Wayland.

"Hence, we see that two views may be taken of an action, when it is contemplated in the light of nature: first, as affecting ourselves; and, secondly, as affecting both ourselves and society, but specially the latter. It is in this latter view that we introduce the doctrine of general consequences. We ask, in order to determine what is our duty; what would be the result if this or that action were universally practised among men? Or, how would it affect the happiness of individuals, and of the whole? By the answer to these questions, we ascertain what is the will of God in respect to that action or course of action. *When once the will of God is ascertained*, conscience, as we have shown, teaches us that we are under the highest obligation to obey it. Thus from the consideration of the greatest amount of happiness, we arrive at the knowledge of our duty, not directly, but indirectly. The feeling of moral obligation does not arise from the simple fact that such a course of conduct will or will not produce the greatest amount of happiness; but, from the fact that *this tendency shows us what is the will of our Creator*: and, we are, by the principles of our nature, under the highest possible obligation to obey that will."

Never did men better exemplify the apostolic description, "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," than the professed disciples of "consequences." With them nothing is morally certain. They can by no possibility conceive of such a thing, as, "doing *right*, regardless of consequences," for to them "right" is the golden spoon at the end of the rainbow, which they may pursue over ditch and quagmire, and be as far from it as ever. Grown wise by experience, they do not expect to reach it—

still it is at the end of the rainbow ! At any given time in the lives of these sage moralists, if they be asked, Are you doing *right* ? the reply must be, No we are watching *consequences*. Otherwise they must be found, at some time or other, engaged in the fanatical business of doing "right regardless of consequences." For ourselves, when we have, by a sufficiently wide induction, come to the conclusion that "the whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other ;" that slavery is at war with all social equality, with all domestic relations, and with all the rights of the soul, thrusting the slave into the place of a brute, and the master into the place of God ; we want no more. We know that the system is one of sin. We know, as surely as that a God of justice sits on the throne of the universe, that the safest possible course is to abandon it immediately. We would just as soon call for additional reason to believe the 47th proposition of Euclid's first book, after reading his own demonstration, as to call for proof that it would be safe to cease from a most flagrant system of robbery and oppression.

But we must hasten to lay before the reader the principles of Dr. Wayland, in regard to human rights. He thus lays down the firm basis of equality—a doctrine which has grown wonderfully unpopular, in the dominant caste, since the proposal of its application to the *Pariahs*.

"The relation in which men stand to each other, is essentially the relation of *equality* ; not *equality of condition*, but *equality of right*.

"Every human being is a distinct and separately accountable individual. To each one, God has given just such means of happiness, and placed him under such circumstances for improving those means of happiness, as it has pleased him. To one he has given wealth ; to another intellect ; to another physical strength ; to another health ; and to all in different degrees. In all other respects, the human race presents a scene of the greatest possible diversity. So far as natural advantages are concerned, we can scarcely find two individuals, who are not created under circumstances widely dissimilar.

"But, viewed in another light, all men are placed under circumstances of *perfect equality*. Each separate individual is created with precisely the *same right to use the advantages* with which God has endowed him, as every other individual. This proposition seems to me in its nature so self evident, as almost to preclude the possibility of argument. The only ground which I can conceive, on which any one could found a plea for *inequality of right*, must be *inequality of condition*. But this can manifestly create no diversity of right. I may have been endowed with better eyesight than my neighbor ; but this evidently gives me no right to put out his eyes, or to interfere with his right to derive from them whatever of happiness the Creator has placed within his power. I may have greater muscular strength than my neighbor ; but this gives me no right to break his

arms, or to diminish, in any manner, his ability to use them for the production of his own happiness. Besides this supposition involves direct and manifest contradiction. For the principle asserted is, that superiority of condition confers superiority of right. But, if this be true, then every kind of superiority of condition must confer corresponding superiority of right. Superiority in muscular strength must confer it, as much as superiority of intellect or of wealth; and must confer it in the ratio of that superiority. In that case, if A. on the ground of intellectual superiority, have a right to improve his own means of happiness, by diminishing those which the Creator has given to B, B would have the same right over A, on the ground of superiority of muscular strength; while C would have a corresponding right over them both, on the ground of superiority of wealth: and so on, indefinitely; and these rights would change every day, according to the relative situation of the respective parties. That is to say, as right is, in its nature, exclusive, all the men in the universe have an exclusive right to the same thing; while the right of every one absolutely annihilates that of every other. What is the meaning of such an assertion, I leave it for others to determine." P. 201—203.

This is the plain truth inculcated in our Declaration of Independence, from which the sophistry of a perverse generation is writhing to free itself. With what force of vapid and impotent obloquy has it not been assailed! There is a spawn of tyrants among us, who are willing the sentiment should be preserved in the archives of the republic, to be brought out pompously on the day when they burn incense to themselves; but, to bring it out for the practical purpose of rescuing the weak from the oppression of the strong, they deem a most insurrectionary proceeding. 'What! teach even the degraded *blacks* that they are equal with ourselves! Why, there is no such thing as equality—except in the distempered brains of political enthusiasts! The thing does not exist, but in theory, among the whites themselves, much less between the whites and the blacks. The latter, indeed, manifestly could not have been contemplated by the signers of the Declaration, in their high wrought "rhetorical flourish." Such is the language uttered over the fresh graves of the "signers"! But what if the Africo Americans were *not* included in the famous Declaration, because not clearly falling within the category of "*all men*"? Their right to the free "pursuit of happiness," is not thereby impaired. They are still rational and accountable beings, and consequently, by their Creator, clothed with rights which no superiority of ours can authorize us to invade. On this point Dr. Wayland has thus happily reasoned.

"If it be said that one class of men is not under the obligation to observe this rule (of reciprocity) in its conduct towards another class of men, then it will be necessary to show that the second class are not men, that is, human beings; for these principles apply to men, as men, and the simple fact that a being is a man, places him within the reach of these obligations and of their protection. Nay,

more, suppose the inferior class of beings were not *truly men*; if they were intelligent moral agents, I suppose we should be under the same obligation to conduct ourselves towards them on the principle of reciprocity. I see no reason why an angel would have a right by virtue of his superior nature to interfere with the means of happiness which God has conferred upon man. By parity of reasoning, therefore, superiority of rank would give to man no such power over an inferior species of moral and intelligent beings." P. 205.

It would naturally be expected, that an author, who should lay such a foundation, would find, in his superstructure, no place to apologize for "domestic slavery." Most amply and opportunely has President Wayland justified this reasonable expectation. Millions will yet bless his memory, that he dared to hurl the chains of their bondage from the elements of the social system, that he dared to proclaim, from the high station in which God placed him, their right to an *immediate* release from the yoke of unrecompensed toil. Did our limits permit, we would quote his whole chapter on Personal Liberty, and with the more pleasure, because it is the work not of a professed abolitionist, laboring expressly to overthrow slavery, but of a good man and sound philosopher, speaking the truth at the risk of unmeasured odium to himself and the institution, which he has done much to bring to the high reputation which it now enjoys. Let us remind the reader, too, that valuable instruction may be derived from the fact that this chapter of Dr. Wayland's, impregnable as it is fortified on the rock of eternal truth, and uttered, as it is, in the calm serenity of science, has called forth from the holders of slaves a response no less bitter than the so called "harsh denunciations" which it has been our business to promulgate.*

* The following, from an editorial article in the *Southern Baptist*, (Charleston, S. C.), may serve as a specimen of southern feeling.

"We thought it a privilege for our young men to have such an instructor, and the fact of graduating under Dr. Wayland would have been a passport to the society of the intelligent. But his Moral Philosophy, which we have for some months been so anxiously expecting, has dispelled our fond hopes, and we must not only cease to recommend Brown University to parents and guardians, but positively dissuade them from sending our young men to that institution, so long as Dr. Wayland shall be its President, or his system of ethics be taught. If Dr. Wayland had desired to *close* the doors of the University against *Southerners*, he could not have resorted to a more effectual expedient than that chapter of his on personal liberty. Those unfriendly to our domestic institutions have seized upon this effort of a master mind and used it as a battering ram, to beat down opposition and subvert the peculiar policy of the South. Wayland, by this single effort is made the *champion* of that party, whether he will or not, and he is proclaimed by the ablest editors of religious prints at the North, as the *invincible* of their party. Shall we send our children to one who will brand their ancestors with immorality and their country with disgrace? To one who will outrage their

"Domestic slavery proceeds," says Dr. Wayland, "upon the principle that the master has a right to control the actions, physical and intellectual, of the slave, for his own, that is, the master's, individual benefit; and, of course, that the happiness of the master, when it comes in competition with the happiness of the slave, extinguishes in the latter the right to pursue it. It supposes, at best, that the relation between master and slave is not that which exists between man and man, but is a modification at least of that which exists between man and the brutes.

Now, this manifestly supposes that the two classes of beings are created with dissimilar rights: that the master possesses rights which have never been conceded by the slave; and that the slave has no rights at all over the means of happiness which God has given him, whenever these means of happiness can be rendered available to the service of the master. It supposes that the Creator intended one human being to govern the physical, intellectual, and moral actions of as many other human beings as by purchase he can bring within his physical power; and, that one human being may thus acquire a right to sacrifice the happiness of any number of other human beings, for the purpose of promoting his own.

Slavery thus violates the personal liberty of man as a physical, intellectual, and moral being.

1. It purports to give to the master a right to control the physical labor of the slave, not for the sake of the happiness of the slave, but for the sake of the happiness of the master. It subjects the amount of labor, and the kind of labor, and the remuneration for labor, entirely to the will of the one party, to the entire exclusion of the will of the other party.

2. But if this right in the master over the slave be conceded, there are of course conceded all other rights necessary to insure its possession. Hence, inasmuch as the slave can be held in this condition only while he remains in the lowest state of mental imbecility, it supposes the master to have the right to control his intellectual development, just as far as may be necessary to secure entire subjection. Thus, it supposes the slave to have no right to use his intellect for the production of his own happiness; but, only to use it in such manner as may conduce to his master's profit.

3. And, moreover, inasmuch as the acquisition of the knowledge of his duty to God could not be freely made without the acquisition of other knowledge, which might, if universally diffused, endanger the control of the master, slavery supposes the master to have the right to determine how much knowledge of his duty a slave shall obtain, the manner in which he shall obtain it, and the manner in which he shall discharge that duty after he shall have obtained a knowledge of it. It thus subjects the duty of man to God entirely to the will of man; and this for the sake of pecuniary profit. It renders the eternal happiness of the one party subservient to the temporal happiness of the other. And this principle is commonly carried into effect in slaveholding countries.

If argument were necessary to show that such a system as this must be at variance with the ordinance of God, it might be easily drawn from the effects which it produces both upon *morals* and upon *national wealth*."

We more than concur in the doubt whether further arguments *are* necessary. But, whether necessary or not, the author proceeds to give them in great force and abundance. His general statement of the argument derivable from Scripture is extremely comprehensive and happy. We think,

feelings, and hold them up to their classmates as violators of the law of God and the rights of man? This Dr. Wayland *expressly* states. He charges us with the violation of personal liberty, and with transgressing that divine command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Or shall we send them to learn *treason* against their country, to be *suspected* when they come *home*, and be *banished* from their firesides if their instructor has *succeeded*? The individual who would send his children with a knowledge of these facts is reckless of consequences.

however, that we shall not be alone in believing that the following paragraph is marred by a flaw, which, we must be pardoned for suspecting, owes its origin to Paley.

"This very course which the Gospel takes on this subject, seems to have been the only one that could have been taken, in order to effect the universal abolition of slavery. The Gospel was designed, not for one race or for one time, but for all races and for all times. It looked not at the abolition of this form of evil for that age alone, but for its universal abolition. Hence, the important object of its author was, to gain it a lodgment in every part of the known world; so that, by its universal diffusion among all classes of society, it might quietly and peacefully modify and subdue the evil passions of men; and thus, without violence, work a revolution in the whole mass of mankind. In this manner alone could its object, a universal moral revolution, have been accomplished. For, if it had forbidden the *evil*, instead of subverting the *principle*; if it had proclaimed the unlawfulness of slavery, and taught slaves to *resist* the oppression of their master; it would instantly have arrayed the two parties in deadly hostility, throughout the civilized world; its announcement would have been the signal of servile war: and the very name of the Christian religion would have been forgotten amidst the agitations of universal bloodshed. The fact, under these circumstances, that the Gospel does not forbid slavery, affords no reason to suppose that it does not mean to prohibit it; much less does it afford ground for belief, that Jesus Christ intended to *authorize it*."

Now, to us, the simple fact, that "the gospel was designed, *not for one race or for one time, but for all races and for all times*," seems abundantly sufficient to account for its want of express prohibitions, not only of slavery, but of gladiatorial games, duels, lotteries, &c. Its genius is not one of statutory enactment, but of constitutional principle. But to say, that the silence of the gospel on any of these subjects was part of a system of *policy*, adapted "to gain it a lodgment," is to accuse it of being false to its own professions, and that, in the face of the highest possible testimony to the contrary, in the lives and *deaths* of its first promulgators. What fact is more prominent on every page of the New Testament, than that Christ and his apostles *did* attack the prejudices of the age in which they lived, in their most sensitive point, and with the least possible reserve in favor of a "lodgment?" Bad as was the slavery of that age, another evil stood before it—*atheistic idolatry*, a system interwoven with the very frame-work of society, and guarded by every jealous lust of depraved humanity. There was wanting the whole of that ground of regard for God and his retributive justice, upon which we are now enabled to attack minor evils. But did the Apostles manifest any solicitude to pursue a line of attack which should avoid violence, and secure a quiet and peaceful diffusion of their principles? So far from this, we are bold to affirm, that they would have met

less violence, had they preferred to confine themselves to preaching "the unlawfulness of slavery" and teaching the slaves "to resist the oppression of their masters." Let the town-meeting of Ephesus, or, indeed, the whole experience of Paul, (2 Cor. xi. 24—27,) be our witness. How absurd to say that such men waved the direct application of their principles to any subject, that they might shun violence, or gain time for the establishment of their principles. No, they trusted in God. While, for reasons of everlasting obligation, they taught slaves (*δοῦλοι*) *not* to resist, they also taught masters to place their relation to their slaves, at once on the footing of *justice and equality*.*

The following passage is liable to no such objection, and must commend itself to every candid inquirer.

"It is important to remember that two grounds of moral obligation are distinctly recognized in the Gospel. The first is our duty to man as man; that is, on the ground of the relation which men sustain to each other: the second is our duty to man as a creature of God; that is, on the ground of the relation which we all sustain to God. On this latter ground, many things become our duty which would not be so on the former. It is on this ground, that we are commanded to return good for evil, to pray for them that despitefully use us, and when we are smitten on one cheek to turn also the other. To act thus is our duty, not because our fellow-man has a right to claim this course of conduct of us, nor because he has a right to inflict injury upon us, but because such conduct in us will be well pleasing to God. And when God prescribes the course of conduct which will be well pleasing to him, he by no means acknowledges the right of abuse in the injurious person, but expressly declares, vengeance is mine and *I will repay it, saith the Lord*. Now, it is to be observed, that it is precisely upon this latter ground, that the slave is commanded to obey his master. It is never urged, like the duty of obedience to parents, *because it is right*; but because the cultivation of meekness and forbearance under injury, will be well pleasing unto God. Thus, servants are commanded to be obedient to their own masters "in singleness of heart *as unto Christ*;" "doing the *will of God* from the heart, with good will doing service *as to the Lord and not to men*." Eph. vi. 5—7. "Servants are commanded to count their masters worthy of all honor, that the name of *God and his doctrine be not blasphemed*." 1 Tim. vi. 1. "Exhort servants to be obedient to their own masters," &c., "that they may adorn the *doctrine of God our Saviour in all things*." Titus iii. 9. The manner in which the duty of servants or slaves is inculcated, therefore, affords no ground for the assertion, that the Gospel authorizes one man to hold another in bondage, any more than the command to honor the king, when that king was Nero, authorized the tyranny of the emperor; or than the command to turn the other cheek, when one is smitten, justifies the infliction of violence by an injurious man." p. 226.

We concur with the author, in his further discussion of the duties of masters, that a work on moral philosophy is not the

* The Apostle Paul is so emphatic on this subject, that it is worth while to mark his *own* language.—Οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχετε, αἰδότες, ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον ἐν οὐρανοῖς.—Col. iv. 1.

place to decide the question of *fact*, whether the slaves are "competent to self government." But we are happy to believe, in the light of *facts*, that they *are* qualified to be impartially governed by the same laws with the rest of the community, better than by any system of special coercion. And these facts, we are happy to say, are fast gaining notoriety and credence, so that we must be permitted to hope that Dr. Wayland's book will pass through few more editions before he will no longer have occasion to say, "As to the question of fact, I do not feel competent to a decision."

Most gladly would we dwell on the many excellencies, every where to be met with, in what we regard as on the whole the richest human gift which has ever been conferred upon the student of Christian morals ; but we must close with a single decisive paragraph.

"If the system be wrong, as we have endeavored to show, if it be at variance with our duty both to God and to man, it must be abandoned. If it be asked when, I ask again, when shall a man begin to leave off doing wrong? Is not the answer, *immediately*? If a man is injuring *us*, do we ever doubt as to the time when *he* ought to cease? There is then no doubt in respect to the time when we ought to cease inflicting injury upon others." P. 227.

RADICALISM—IN REPLY TO THE LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

BY REV. BERIAH GREEN, PRESIDENT OF ONEIDA INSTITUTE.

It may be interesting to our readers to learn, that a few pages of the seventh number of the Literary and Theological Review, the Reverend Editor has devoted to the subject of "Radicalism." Whether the intrinsic worth of his article entitles it to the notice, we design to give it, or not, is a question we shall not stop to discuss. Its claims on other grounds to some attention, we cheerfully admit. The position, which Mr. Woods is permitted to maintain among those goodly people, who are horror struck at the thought of an immediate and thorough reformation in any respect, in our "Political and Ecclesiastical Institutions," gives to his paragraphs the value of an INDEX to what is so often and so significantly called *the public sentiment*.

The justness of Mr. Woods' *description of the "picture"* he has given us, we shall not undertake to gainsay. Before he had put on the finishing *blot*, he owns, that under his hand, "it had already become so dark and grim visaged, that (how elegantly quaint!) he was feign to break company with it." For this finishing blot, we are, it seems, indebted to the dregs of "old Isaac Walton's" ink bottle. Mr. Woods' "picture" brings to our mind a story, we remember somewhere to have read about a painter, who undertook to decorate the hall of a nobleman's house with a picture of the Red Sea. Having daubed over the whole wall with cheap red paint, he invited his employer to examine and approve the work, he had "finished." "Why, what have we here," exclaimed the astonished nobleman. "The Red Sea, to be sure." "And where are the Israelites?" "Passed over," said he of the brush. "And the Egyptians, where are they?" demanded the embarrassed lord of the hall. "*All drowned*," replied the painter. It is very kind in Mr. W. to stand by his "picture," to inform us for whom it was intended. It is no more, however, than might have been expected from so warm an admirer of things ancient; as he may well be supposed to have remembered that the old painters used to write under the figures that they had drawn; "This is a horse; and that, a lion."

Who were the men, "so dark and grim visaged" that sat for Mr. W's. "finished" portrait? Shrewdly anticipating the perplexity which his readers might feel on this point, he has condescendingly given them full information. Let us hear him.

"The over zealous advocate of temperance, not content with the just, but qualified principle that the *abuse* of ardent spirits, as of every thing else, is immoral and their common *use* to be dissuaded on grounds of expediency, soon arrives at the clearer unlimited doctrine, that *all use of spirits is sin*. He now proceeds to the application of this sweeping principle and is led by it in consistency to condemn the use one after another of those substances, in which Alcohol is found dispersed in however minute proportions, and to whatever degree diluted. And now since even the purest fermented wines contain a portion of alcohol, they too must be condemned, not on the score of the inexpediency but the immorality of their use, and not merely as a common beverage, but in the Sacrament of the Supper, where they are one of the elements appointed by Christ and uniformly employed in the Church. To such absurd and even impious consequences are men brought by neglecting to observe the fixed boundaries of right principles and these infinitely varying circumstances by which their application must be modified! The same habit of extreme generalization applied to the subject of natural rights furnished Rousseau and Paine with those unlimited maxims which captivated the common mind by their clearness, and, when carried into application

produced the French Revolution. And it is the same unfortunate habit, applied to the same subject, which is now putting into the mouths of our Anti-Slavery Societies maxims equally unlimited, clear and captivating, and equally false and dangerous." pp. 524, 525.

Those then who think it sinful to gratify an unnatural appetite with a substance which it is perfectly certain and notorious is of deadly tendency in its bearing on the human constitution; which has been the cause of crimes of every kind, distresses of every sort, deaths of every stamp; and which considered as a drink is useful to none but the distiller, the grave digger and the devil; and those who think it is sinful to maintain a complicated and extended system of theft, adultery and murder;—those, *those* are the "dark grim visaged" creatures, whose "picture," even to the finishing stroke Mr. W. professes to have given! Let us devote a few moments to the delicate touches of this discriminative and exquisite artist. The ugly and mischievous beings, from whose very picture Mr. W. "is feign to break company," he thus holds up to general abhorrence and execration. "Weary of the established order of things, they rush into *every innovating enterprise*, without waiting to inquire whither it leads. Extending their disaffection from the abuses of the institutions" (such of course as *dram shops* and *slave markets* legally opened and protected!) "under which they have lived to the institutions themselves, they would gladly witness their overthrow." Instead of "tolerating an acknowledged abuse, reckless of consequences, they will pluck up the tares, even if in so doing they should pluck up the wheat with them." "With an impatience equally childish and irreligious, they demand immediate results, even where they *cannot be accelerated without a miracle!* and where, if they be unduly hastened, they must be *fatally disastrous.*" Their peculiarities, contemplated in the abstract are described as "zeal without knowledge;"—"passion without reason;"—"an eyeless vigor rushing through a path beset with evils;"—"a chainless torrent of popular excitement" (*the mob-creating power of course!*) "breaking through every barrier" (even through the authority of *LAW*, where the public good is to be promoted, as in ransacking the mail and burning its contents!) "and hurling itself through lifted flood gates" (rushing to conventions of intelligent and peaceable citizens to insult and abuse them) "upon

the delicate and complicated machinery of human society." pp. 522, 523.

Such according to Mr. W. is a just description of the men and women, who as they hate sin, hate alcohol drinking and slaveholding! But for his masterly sketch, we should never once have thought, that of such an original such a picture could be drawn. If it were not as malignantly as it is ridiculously incongruous, we should be tempted to exclaim in the language of old Horace :

Spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?*

We scarcely know how to demean ourselves among the men, whom Mr. W. has forced to keep company with us. They must, we suppose, feel themselves harshly treated and greatly degraded. We would offer them our sympathies, if the contempt, which they have often thrown into our face and eyes had not taught us to beware how we approach lofty dignity. We are not "to blame" for the low estate to which in the eyes of Mr. W. and his portly friends they are reduced.—We hope they will pardon us, if we humbly suggest, that in order to be comfortable, they must either go back toward the dark ages and take their place among those, who with "manly patience and religious composure" maintain "*that the ABUSE of ardent spirits AS OF EVERY THING ELSE*" (brown bread and cold water for instance) "*is immoral, AND THEIR COMMON USE to be dissuaded on grounds of expediency*, or go forward and take their position, as some of the noblest of their number have lately done, among those, *who were no more despised than themselves*, till it was seen that at all hazards, they would cling to the cause of truth and righteousness. We might add more but we fear, they would be angry with us.

In the spirit of an *old* and therefore *true* saying, that it is lawful to learn from an enemy, we doubt not Mr. W. would take a hint even from an ultraist.† We therefore suggest

* Admitted to such a sight, could you, my friends, refrain from laughter?

† Perhaps Mr. W. would prefer, in extending his contrast, to receive hints from an anti-ultraist. If so, we beg not to be considered "unmannerly," if we remind him of some very instructive things once said by a philosopher, who was remarkable for his tact, in keeping *the application of general principles within un-radical limits*. We refer to the beautiful contrast, which Mr. BY-ENDS drew out, between himself on the one hand, and Christian and Hopeful on the other. In the style of Mr. Woods it may be thus given. The *Reformer* is for waiting for wind and tide; but the *Radical*, after his headstrong manner, concludes, that it is his

that in case he should publish a second edition of his article on Radicalism for the eye of the great Metternich, who could not but be edified and refreshed thereby, that to the long string of points in which, *with great judgment and power*, he has held up the Reformer in contrast with the Radical, it might be well to add one or two things of a more practical and specific character. He might say, the *Reformer* regards the brown and ragged wood-sawyer with his coarse jug of cheap whiskey with abhorrence, as a sinner of the first magnitude; while, with "manly patience and religious composure," he keeps his place in the circles of the wealthy and refined through which the blushing wine briskly circulates: but the *Radical* with "eyeless vigor" would with one blow dash to a common destruction the wine cask and the whiskey barrel! The *Reformer* sees the African slave-trader—an unlettered, ill taught, dark minded wretch, fastened, as a pirate, on the gibbet, with complacency and gratification, while he views the intelligent, genteel, *chivalrous* slave grower and soul driver of the South, with tender forbearance and paternal love and patriotic pride; but the *Radical* would have them both strangled with the different ends of the same rope!

As we have already intimated, Mr. W. employed the hand of "old Isaac Walton," a great adept in the science of *angling*—to give the "finishing stroke" to his picture of Radicalism. It may be interesting and instructive to our readers to see this "finishing stroke" exhibited at full length.—Here they have it. "In his Life of *Thomas* (RICHARD,* we suppose) Hooker, speaking of the NON-CONFORMISTS of those times, he says;—"Of this party there were many that were possessed of a high degree of

duty to rush on his journey all weathers. The *Reformer* is for taking all advantages to secure his life and estate; but the *Radical* is for hazarding all for God at a clap. The *Reformer* is for religion in *what* AND SO FAR AS, the times and his safety will bear it: but the *Radical* is for holding his notions, though all other men be against them. The *Reformer* is for religion, when he walks in his silver slippers, in the sun-shine, and with applause; but the *Radical* is for him when in rags and contempt.

What a splendid model for a popular theological professor, might not a skillful artist construct from the materials, furnished by Mr. *By-ends* and his friends, in the conversation to which the above contrast belongs! The metal here afforded, an enterprising *brazier* might probably beat out into a number of imposing articles, of the same stamp and spirit, as Mr. W's, on Reform and Radicalism.—See PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, *Am. Tract Soc. edition*, pp. 128—132.

* This exchange of names would as ill suit the "unmanerly" Non-conformists of Hartford, as the high-churchmen of England.

spiritual wickedness—I mean with an innate restless pride and malice. I do not mean the visible and carnal sins of gluttony, and drunkenness, and the like, (from which God deliver us,) but sins of a higher nature, because they are more unlike God, who is the God of love and mercy, and order and peace; and more like the devil (who is not a glutton, nor can be drunk and yet a devil); but I mean those *spiritual wickednesses of malice and revenge and an opposition to government*;—men that *joyed to be the authors of misery*, which is properly his work that is the enemy and disturber of mankind; and thereby GREATER SINNERS THAN THE GLUTTON OR THE DRUNKARD, though some will not believe it. And of this party there were also many whom prejudice and a furious zeal had so blinded as to make them neither to hear reason nor adhere to the ways of peace;—men that were the VERY DREGS and *pest of mankind*; men whom pride and self conceit had made to over-value their own pitiful and crooked wisdom, *so much as not to be ashamed to hold unmannerly disputes* against those men they ought to reverence, and those laws they ought to obey; men that labored and joyed first to FIND OUT *the faults*; and then to speak evil of government and to be the authors of confusion; men whom company, conversation and custom had at last so blinded, and made insensible that these were sins, that like those that perished in the gainsaying of Core, so those died without repenting of their spiritual wickednesses.” pp. 535, 536.

As Mr. W. has poured it upon the heads of the Radicalists with whom he had to do, *we* feel a special interest in examining this sweet effusion of “the GENTLE spirit of Walton.”* What ailed the NON-CONFORMISTS, that they must be so gently described as the “very dregs and pests of mankind;” “greater sinners than the glutton and the drunkard,” and as worthy to be “likened to the devil?” According to the showing of the great angler himself, what had they done? Hear the charges which Isaac Walton brings against them; and blushing, be “feign to break company” with your ancestors, all ye who trace your descent from those “very dregs and pests of mankind,” the *Non-conformists* whose bones were broken with the iron sceptre of Eliza-

* Page 536.

beth, and we suppose the "gentle spirit" of Southey would eagerly add, *the Puritans* of the reign of the *martyred* Charles!

1. These "sinners greater than the drunkard and the glutton," were so "like the devil," as "not to be ashamed to hold UNMANNERLY DISPUTES against those men they ought to reverence, and those laws they ought to obey;" and

2. "They labored and joyed FIRST TO FIND OUT THE FAULTS, and then to speak evil of government!"

As these "pests of mankind" could hardly have been duly punished by the "gentle" inflictions of those dignified, merciful, CONSERVATIVE tribunals, the High Commission Court and Star Chamber, I know of no better expedient now remaining to strike a salutary terror into all modern innovators, ultraists and incendiaries, than for that prop of the constitution and laws of this republic—that great supporter of the UNION, the "chivalrous" Judge Lynch to offer a "large reward" for *their bones* safely delivered on the "*south side of the Potomac*," where they would be treated according to their merits. But this is a matter which it becomes us to give over to those "gentle" mobs which are "headed" by judges and representatives, and made up of "gentlemen of standing and property." In the light which LEONARD WOODS, Jr. pours upon them, such men as Justin Edwards, and Moses Stuart, and Calvin Chapin, and William Goodell, and Edward C. Delavan, and Gerrit Smith, and Alvan Stewart, and thousands upon thousands like them, who with "eyeless vigor" have rushed beyond the limits of the old conservative doctrine, "that the *abuse* of ardent spirits *as of every thing else*, is immoral, and their common use to be dissuaded on grounds of *expediency*;" and such men as Moses Brown, and Nathaniel Emmons, and the Tappans, and William Jay, and James G. Birney, and William L. Garrison, and Elon Galusha, and Samuel Crothers, and N. S. S. Beman, and the Wrights, and the Cox's, and the Rankins, and thousands upon thousands like them, who regard the act of holding a human creature as property as sin;—all these men in such light may see the "finishing stroke of their own picture." But we are sure they will be cheered instead of mortified when they remember, that according to Mr. W. himself, only a slender feeble *partition* stands between them and the Non-

conformists. To such company we are persuaded they would gladly be joined, living, dying, forever.

In application to the Non-conformists themselves, Mr. W. does not deny the justness of Walton's description! He dismisses the old calumniator with the following remarkable sentence: "If this description should APPEAR to be unjust towards those for whom it was intended, it may be urged in apology, that it was EXTORTED from the '*gentle spirit of Walton*' by the strength of his love for the venerable Hooker, who SUFFERED MUCH FROM THE OPPOSITION OF THE NON-CONFORMISTS." p. 536.—Hooker, amidst the sunshine of court and church favor, "*suffered much*" from the helpless, bleeding victims of court and church vengeance! So much indeed, as to *extort* from a gentle spirit such a torrent of gall and wormwood! What a problem have we here to solve!

As a specimen of Hooker's "suffering," take the history of his quarrel with *Walter Travers*, his colleague in the Temple pulpit. To Mr. Travers, the old church historian Fuller, whose authority is of great weight in the English church, gives the following highly attractive character: "His utterance was agreeable, his gestures plausible, his matter profitable, his method plain, and his style carried in it the flowings of grace from a sanctified heart." Hooker preached in the morning, when, according to Fuller, "some said the congregation ebbed," and Travers in the afternoon, when "some said the congregation flowed," "the first occasion in the view of some, of emulation between them,"—though Fuller thinks that Hooker was "too wise to take exception at such trifles." However this might be, they differed from each other, in some respects, in the doctrines which they taught. This difference led to I know not how much disputation, "*unmannerly*," of course, on the side of Travers. At length Hooker "*suffered so much*" from this "dreg"-gy and "pest"-ilent Non-conformist, that he made complaint against him; when Archbishop Whitgift—a great conservative of the powers and prerogatives of the "gentle" Elizabeth—suspended Mr. Travers at once, without any warning. For Mr. *Hooker* "suffered so much," that, as Mr. TRAVERS was going into the pulpit to preach on the *Lord's day afternoon*, the officer served him with a prohibition on the pulpit stairs! The grand offence laid to

his charge, "was, that contrary to the orders of the Queen, he had brought disputes into the pulpit!" *Hooker* "*suffered so much*" from this Non-conformist, that "*Travers*, left to the mercy (mercy!) of the Archbishop, could *never* escape from his suspension, or have licence to preach in any part of *England*; upon which he accepted an invitation into *Ireland*, and became Provost of Trinity College, in the University of Dublin; here he was tutor of the famous Dr. Usher, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, who always had him in high esteem; but being driven from thence by the wars, he returned after some years into England, and *spent the remainder of his days* IN SILENCE, OBSCURITY, AND GREAT POVERTY!" How must the gentle spirit of Walton have been wrung to see *Hooker* "suffer so much," as *Travers* was called to endure! Mr. W. also may have been exposed to "unmannerly" disputants—may have "suffered much;" hence his ready sympathy with Walton and the venerable *Hooker*. Such sufferings might be greatly alleviated, if *Hooker's* LIBERAL DOCTRINE could once obtain firm footing and general prevalence in this land, viz.: "*Mr. Travers* ought to have complained to the *High Commissioners*, and NOT HAVE CONFUTED ME IN THE PULPIT; for schisms and disturbances will arise in the Church, if all men may be TOLERATED TO THINK AS THEY PLEASE, AND PUBLICLY SPEAK WHAT THEY THINK." A good doctrine on which to frame an "apology" for the Synod of Philadelphia for their late "gentle" suspension of Albert Barnes; for how much have they not suffered from the opposition of this "unmannerly" Non-conformist!

It ought to be added to this account of the "sufferings" of *Hooker*, that Mr. *Travers* was junior preacher in the Temple before *Hooker* was admitted to its pulpit; that after the death of Dr. Alvey, senior preacher, *Travers* was hindered from taking the place of "Master" only by the scruples of his "unmannerly" conscience, which would not consent to his subscribing to Whitgift's arbitrary test; and that *Hooker's* magnanimous subscription brought him over the head of *Travers* into the "Master's" place.

We have dwelt thus long on the case of *Hooker* and *Travers*, to illustrate, through Mr. W.'s remarkable apology for Walton, the spirit of the anti-ultraists, with whom we have to do. Whatever may be the measure of "manly pa-

tience and religious composure" with which they are gifted, it is very clear and certain, that there are "sufferings," which can arouse even their sympathies. But what sufferings; and whose? Not of the persecuted and oppressed. It would be vulgar, to regard them and their fiery trials, with tender compassion. Insult and outrage are their proper allotments, from which it would be "unmannerly" to attempt to escape. But when they see iron-hearted tyrants, and lordly hierarchs exposed and "confuted" and resisted; what indescribable yearnings do they not feel! What impassioned "apologies" are "extorted" from their lips and pens! And can NEW ENGLAND, with all her veneration for the Puritans and Non-conformists, commit to such hands her sanctified sons, to be trained for the labors of the pulpit! In *this day*, when the King of Zion is marshalling His armies for the battle, are the future leaders of "the Sacramental Host," to be taught by their appointed guides to look on and see an old, time-serving angler spit his gall and venom in the faces of those noble confessors of the soul-trying reign of Elizabeth, with complacency;—aye, and to frame "apologies" for the bitter and malignant calumniator. which imply, that the Non-conformists were treated well enough! Among the signs of the times, which we are in duty bound to observe, we regard none as more dark and portentous. And we cannot scruple to call on the friends of God and man in New England, and especially in *Maine*, to weigh *this matter well*.

Among the features, which characterize the "dark and grim visaged picture" of the "ultra reformers of the present day," which Mr. W. "finished," he describes the following habit. "In the earlier stages of their efforts, they are seen groping after some *simple, unqualified principle*, on which their own minds can rest, and by which they can act upon the public. And since they have *nothing* of that depth or sagacity of mind, which would enable them to discern the true bounds of principles, how far they apply, and where and why the application of them fails, they soon arrive at some unlimited generality of doctrine. And their business thenceforward is to carry it into effect, even in cases where its application, to an unsophisticated mind, must appear plainly unjust and pernicious," p. 524. For this habit, Mr.

W. regards the "over-zealous advocates of temperance" and of human freedom as remarkable.

The ultraists have good reason to congratulate themselves, that in his discriminative arrangements, Mr. W. has not assigned them a place among the men, who never, either at the commencement or termination of their efforts, grope after *any simple principle*, on which their minds may rest and which they may make it their business to carry into effect, but who compass their ends by perpetually ringing in the public ear various changes on certain ominous phrases. When they would set the rabble at their heels upon their honest neighbors, they make them bark and bite by shouting in their ears ; *The Constitution must be preserved*, though they themselves are violently assailing it ; *The Union must be maintained*, though they themselves are stabbing it to the heart ; *Beware of amalgamation*, whilst they themselves zealously support the only system of amalgamation in the nation ! Doubtless the "strength of his love" for these "gentle conservatists" instead of permitting him to censure them, would "make him their apologist."

With our readers consent we will venture to propose a case to Mr. W. and his fellow conservatists. They doubtless remember the Priest and the Levite, who, when they saw the prostrate wretch that had been half killed by thieves, passed by "with manly patience and religious composure" on the other side. It is easy to suppose, that those men retired together from that collection of "gentlemen of standing and property," which, as a mock-tribunal, had condemned Jesus of Nazareth to endure the death of a slave. The silent awe, which the dignified demeanor of the great Sufferer had impressed even on their minds, the Levite at length thus broke ; Holy Father, much as I abhor "that deceiver," I cannot say, that I am altogether pleased with the scene we have just been witnessing. Such a rude violation of human rights alarms me. I fear, first, that the sufferings of the Nazarene will attract general sympathy, and thus increase his followers ; and, secondly, that those who have raised a mob to trample *him* in the mire will some time feel the weight of the same iron hoofs.

Priest. Such extraordinary evils, dear son, sometimes break out as demand extraordinary remedies. In such ca-

ses, the public good requires, that great men should rise above themselves and above the laws, and take summary and speedy vengeance on those, who, like "this fellow" "pervert the people."

Levite. Rabbi, be so kind as to inform me on what grounds the Nazarene is to be treated as an outlaw. I hate him heartily enough, but I know little of his history. I have a general impression, that he goes about "turning the world upside down;" and I always abhorred a *Radical*.

Priest. A radical he is, of the worst stamp. "In the earlier stages of his efforts, he was seen groping after some simple, unqualified principles, on which his own mind could rest, and by which he could act upon the public." Some of these, "equally unlimited, clear and captivating," I happen to remember. "*God is a spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.*" "*Not that which goeth into the mouth, defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man.*" "*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*" "*I will have mercy and not sacrifice.*" "*That which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.*" "*A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things that he possesseth.*" "*It is more blessed to give than to receive.*" "*Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness sake; for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.*" "*Fear not them that kill the body.*" "*Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another commiteth adultery.*" "The true bounds of such principles, how far they apply, and why and where the application of them fails, he has not the sagacity to discern." "For want of knowing what others have done before him"—for he despises the *traditions* of the elders—"he has no standard, to which he may refer." To the claims of *prescriptive authority* "he pays no due respect," and has little "deference to age, office, or other titles to regard." "Putting on the airs of a Dictator in the moral kingdom," he sets himself to oppose what "has been said by them of old." He is remarkable for "sternness, rigor, and rudeness of demeanor towards even the slightest delinquency." "I have heard him declare, without any qualification, that "he who looketh on a woman to lust after her has committed adultery already with her in his heart." The greatest and best men among us he calls "serpents"—

"a generation of vipers," and tauntingly asks them "how they can escape the damnation of hell"! I shudder to remember what I once heard break like a thunder-clap from his lips; "Woe unto you Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites; which devour widows houses, and for a pretence make long prayers; therefore, ye shall receive greater damnation"! Thus, "not content with relieving, he would also *avenge* the oppressed; not content with restraining, he would also *doom* the oppressor. You know, my dear son, how often and how earnestly, I have urged upon you such sentiments as the following; **"Let me advise you to walk EVER in the beaten road of the Church; not to run into single paradoxes. And if you meet at any time with private conceits, that seem more probable, suspect them and yourself; and if they can win you to assent,† yet smother them in your breast, and do not dare to vent them out, either by your hand or tongue, to trouble the common peace."* But this "pestilent fellow," far from modestly yielding his own principles to the "general voice," even for the sake of preventing "disturbance," boldly declares, that he came not to send peace on the earth but a sword. I once heard him even say, that "he came to send *fire on the earth*." He intends to set all men a quarrelling with each other; to break up the peace of every family, to which he has access; to dissolve the "glorious union" with the people, under whose protection we are so safe and

* Quoted from BISHOP Hall, by Mr. W. with apparent approbation. p. 529.

† This most beautiful, impressive, and instructive quotation, which old Money-love himself could not equal, enables us to understand on what ground such men as Mr. W. resist all arguments, which are adapted to bring them to espouse the cause of the oppressed. If we could "win their assent," their respect to the general voice "would constrain them to *"SMOTHER it in their breast;"* they would not "dare to vent it out either by their hands or tongue." Now in the language of that "gentle spirit," the "venerable Money-love," this complying temper "argueth:—

1. That they are of a self-denying temper;
2. Of a sweet and winning deportment; And,
3. So more fit for the ministerial function," of course, whether as preachers, reviewers, or professors. What a crop of John Baptists, Simon Peters, Pauls, Luthers, Calvins, and Knox's; Baxters, Wesleys, and Whitefields; Edwards', and Tenants, must not the hand of such "nursing-fathers" produce! Stick to the breasts of "Mother-church," though sprinkled with plague-spots; though covered with ulcers—though with every breath, you should suck in, not milk, but purulent filth. Never be convinced of any error as long as you can help it; and when conviction is forced upon you, hold your breath till your face gathers blackness. Here we have *Protestantism* with a witness;—such Protestantism as would go bare-foot to *Rome* for the *pious* purpose of kissing the great toe of the pope!

happy ; so "that, if we let him alone, "the Romans will come and take away our place and nation," surely, "it is **EXPEDIENT** for us, that one man should die for the people, and *that the whole nation perish not.*"

Levite. Enough, reverend father, I can hear no more, I burn to join in the loud shouts of the multitude, he has so often insulted and outraged by his incendiary doctrines, and inflammatory appeals ; "crucify him, crucify him ! His blood be on us and on our children !"

Mr. W. knows, that from the hour of the crucifixion to the present, all true reformers have been regarded, by courtly conservatists, as perverters of the people ; pestilent fellows ; the turners of the world upside down ; ultraists and radicals. And all, for the same reasons. They have all been engaged with warm hearts and strong hands in drawing forth from the dust, where they had long been concealed, each in his time and place, some elementary truth—some fundamental principle in ethics and religion, which they have made it their business to explain and propagate. For this, the "general voice" has for a time been "given *against* them" in reproaches and execrations, but ultimately—on to the present generation—for them, as the benefactors of mankind. We must here be permitted to repeat a paragraph from Coleridge ; "Still, however, there are truths so self-evident, or so immediately and palpably deduced from those that are, or are acknowledged for such, that they are at *once intelligible to all men* who possess the common advantages of the social state ; although by *sophistry*, by evil habit, by *the neglect, false persuasions* and impostures of an Anti-Christian priesthood *joined in one CONSPIRACY* with the violence of *tyrannical governors*, the understanding of men may have become so darkened and their consciences so lethargic, that there may arise a necessity for the re-publication of these truths, and this too with a *voice of loud alarm*, and *impassioned warning*. Such were the doctrines proclaimed by the first christians to the pagan world ; such were the lightnings flashed by Wickliff, Huss,¹ Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Latimer, &c. across the papal darkness, and *such in our own times the truths with which Thomas Clarkson, and his excellent confederates, the Quakers, fought and conquered the LEGALIZED BANDITTI of*

men-stealers, the numerous and powerful perpetrators and advocates of rapine and murder, and (of BLACKER GUILT than either) SLAVERY. Truths of this kind being indispensable to man, considered as a moral being, are *above all EXPEDIENCY, all accidental consequences*; for as sure as God is holy, and man immortal, there can be no evil so great as the ignorance or disregard of them. *It is the very madness of mock prudence to oppose the removal of a poisonous dish on account of the pleasant sauces or nutritious viands which would be lost with it!* The dish contains destruction to that, for which alone we wish the palate to be gratified or the body to be nourished." The Friend, pp. 49, 50.

We could easily prove even by the testimony of our adversaries, that the Anti-Slavery societies in this country are engaged in the same war, on the same principles, with the same weapons, against the same sort of enemies, as Thomas Clarkson, William Wilberforce, George Stephen, and the Quakers in England, carried on with so much ardor, and with such glorious success. The same reproach and opposition befel them, as assails us. Trusting in the same Savior, we dare hope for the same glorious consummation of our labors and sufferings as crowned theirs.

We shall venture, in conclusion, to commend to Mr. W. a task, which well performed, would do more towards putting down the radicals, whose movements so "heave his placid nature into tumult," than a thousand volumes of such dark and misty matter, as in his article on Radicalism, he has thrown before the eyes of his readers. Let him mend his pen, and clearly and certainly 'demonstrate for the benefit of the ultra advocates of Temperance :

1. That well instructed and faithfully warned, we may gratify a factitious appetite with a substance, which is naturally and necessarily injurious to the constitution, God has given us, *without sin.*

2. That to obtain such a substance, we may expend any part of that property which we had solemnly dedicated to God our Savior, *without sin.*

3. That in so doing, we may tempt our weaker brethren to go beyond ourselves in such animal indulgences—to the manifest peril of their present virtue and future peace, *without sin.*

For the benefit of the ultra advocates of human freedom, let him prove with like certainty and clearness :

1. That the negro is not a *man*.
2. That we may hold him, innocent of crime, in subser-
vency to our will, as a piece of property, *without sin*.
3. That we may lend an influence to support an extend-
ed and complicated system of theft, adultery, and murder,
without sin.

The performance of this task, *and this alone*, can shut the mouths of the so called radicals, whom he is so anxious to reduce to silence. The performance of this task, and this alone, can set him free from the charge, which we now solemnly bring against him—the charge of being a *calum-
niator of his brethren*.

A REVIEW.—LEGISLATION AGAINST LIBERTY.— ANTI-REPUBLICAN EDUCATION.

BY WILLIAM GOODELL.

I. "LETTERS against the immediate Abolition of Slavery, addressed to the Free Blacks of the non Slaveholding States. By T. R. SULLIVAN. Comprising a legal opinion on the powers of legislatures in non slaveholding States, to prevent measures tending to general and immediate emancipation, in a Letter to the Author, from WILLIAM SULLIVAN, L. L. D. Published with his permission. [The whole printed in the Boston Courier.] Boston. Hilliard, Gray & Co. 1835."

II. "THE POLITICAL CLASS BOOK, intended to instruct the higher classes in schools, in the origin, nature and use of political power. By WILLIAM SULLIVAN, Counsellor at Law, &c. &c. Boston. [Second edition.] Richardson, Lord, and Holbrook. 1831."

I. We shall begin with the work first mentioned, though its publication is last in the order of time.—The author informs us in his preface, that "the work was suggested by the writer's perception, of the want of some means to counteract the impressions which anti-slavery orators were attempting to make among the *general population of the northern States*."—"The opinions of citizens of Boston, at meetings called in contravention of those *increasing influ-
ences*," he observes, "did not necessarily represent those of the village and country inhabitants, were not distinctly indicative of the feelings of the *people at large*," &c. * * *

"A check more effectual than public meetings is demanded by the crisis. The south claims 'efficient measures' for its security against 'insurrectionary and aggressive' acts, in the non slaveholding States, and points out 'legislative enactments,' as the means, because it is perceived that such only will be efficient."

The "general population of the northern States" will be *instructed*, we think, if not edified, with this explicit avowal! They are in danger, it seems, in the opinion of "the south," of being carried away with "the anti-slavery orators" if they are *permitted* to hear them, and so there must be "legislative enactments" to *prevent* them from hearing! No other means "will be efficient." Mobs and meetings have been tried, and found inadequate. The "anti-slavery orators" are gaining ground, after all; and their "increasing influence" with the "general population" is unchecked by the city meetings. The "village and country inhabitants" will still think for themselves, and therefore they must not be permitted to hear!—"As long as the controversy," says the author, "is confined to a struggle for the supremacy of public opinion, the Abolitionists gain as much as they lose!"

Aye! and *more* too! There lies the difficulty.—But what shall be done?—The author proceeds:

"But as soon as the conflict is between anti-slavery societies and the law, there will be something more serious to contend with than public sentiment. It is not probable that their leaders themselves would long persist, nor obtain many to unite with them, or adhere to them, in advocating abstract principles in such a manner as to expose themselves to the cognizance and penalties of the laws of the land."

In other words, "the general population," the "people at large," "the village and country inhabitants," will be *over-awed* when they find that the "laws of the land" forbid them to listen to the "abstract principles" of inalienable human rights! The remedy, it must be confessed, would be a sovereign specific, if the patient could only be persuaded to swallow it.—People of the free States! What say you? Are you ready for the process?

With such a *preface*, our readers will have no occasion to be surprised at any thing which the body of the work may contain. As that "work was suggested by the writer's perception, of the want of some means" to crush the

most precious liberties of "the general population of the northern States," we need not wonder at the arguments and measures by which he would accomplish his object!

One of the first and most prominent topics of complaint, urged by our author against the "anti-slavery orators," is their appeals to the "passions of the multitude, including the women and children, the boarding school misses and factory girls." Female influence, more than almost any thing else, and especially the influence of "intelligent and virtuous woman," appears to haunt the imagination of Mr. T. R. Sullivan, as an almost incurable evil, which nothing but the strong arm of legislation can suppress! Hear him:

"Men, every where, so far as my observation extends, *particularly in this free land, are too much inclined to yield to the direction of intelligent and virtuous women!*"

Now, we may be antiquated and singular in our views. We had supposed that the influence of profligate, ignorant, vicious, frivolous, idle, and abandoned women, was more dangerous than that of the intelligent and virtuous, especially in a republic! We had not supposed that the nation was in jeopardy, and that freedom of speech, and of the press, must be prohibited by legislation, because the industrious females in our factories, and the intelligent young ladies in our seminaries of learning, were in danger of hearing too much, and of exerting too great an influence on great questions of public morals!—But we stand corrected. We see, now, why it is that female meetings for prayer, both in Providence and Boston, have been insulted by hostile assemblies of "gentlemen of property and standing." They were too "intelligent and virtuous!" And if mobs and city "meetings called in contravention of these increasing influences" cannot suffice, the laws—for *laws* are marvellously efficient of late—must supply the deficiency!

The author proceeds to specify, in detail, the things which ought not to be *permitted to woman*—"intelligent and virtuous woman"—to hear from the lips of "anti-slavery orators." That he may not be "unjust to the American Anti-Slavery Society and its active friends," Mr. T. R. Sullivan assures us, that he states nothing that he has not himself "seen and heard, while present at the large and promiscuous assemblies, by them called together." Let the reader now prepare himself for a developement that shall

show the imperious necessity of laws which shall "*effectually*" prevent "the general population of the northern States"—"the people at large"—"the village and country inhabitants," (who, unfortunately, are not sufficiently influenced by "the opinions of citizens in Boston") from listening to "the anti-slavery orators," at "large and promiscuous assemblies" of the "sovereign people," and their own families, wives and daughters!—Hear him!

"There," says the author, "have I seen woman's tears testifying to the portion of the audience, in an appeal to which the anti-slavery agitator best loves to indulge, and I have seen that appeal enforced by allusions to points on which woman is most sensitive (in relation, that is, to the illicit intercourse to which the relation of master and slave is said to give opportunity,) at which the face of modest woman was turned from the speaker, and covered from the spectator's eye. Who does not know, that the *popular art* is never more triumphant than when it can enlist the *peculiar* feelings (whether of party, denomination, or sex.) on the side of what is called public justice, or sound policy, or righteous indignation?*

"I attended a meeting, on another occasion, in a manufacturing town, in which eight hundred factory girls were numbered with the female population, and heard a reverend orator ask an audience, two thirds of which were females, whether the 'laws' at the south, permitting man 'to hold man as property,' and 'to break the conjugal tie, and separate families at will,' were to be approved"—and how they would like to see a father or brother compelled to work daily 'without wages' like a horse or an ox, or to see wives and husbands, parents and children, in their neighborhood, torn from each other, by the arm of a domestic tyrant, and sustained by the laws of the land!—Is it proper to propose inquiries of so grave a character to thronged assemblies composed chiefly of females? Nay, when such questions are not merely speculative but immediately affect the *legal property*, the personal security, the *domestic customs* and constitutional privileges of thousands of our countrymen, not belonging to our own state, nor even to our own New England states, is it not reprehensible and mischievous to agitate them, by making impressions on the susceptible mind of woman, and by sowing the seeds of sectional prejudice and hostility in the tender hearts of children and youth? Is it a justification, that the authors of these rash proceedings, *intend* no interference with the legal rights of their fellow citizens, but *mean* only to instruct the public mind, and direct the public feeling, by the exhibition of abstract truth applied to unquestionable fact, so that the household despot of the south, and legalized oppressor of the African, shall be constrained (only by the force of public opinion, look ye,) to give liberty to the captive, and wipe the disgrace of the slave laws from the statute book?"

Surely the *necessity* of legislation against "Anti-Slavery Orators" is very plainly made out! The author had good reason to speak, in his Preface, of their "increasing influence" among the "village and country inhabitants!" Good reason had he to say that nothing but "legislative enactments" "will be efficient," against them!—Just as certainly as "the general population of the Northern States" are *per-*

* And yet, Mr. William Sullivan, on the last page of the same pamphlet, resorts to the "popular art" of pleading against emancipation, lest amalgamation should follow. It is an *adulterous* amalgamation, that must not be spoken against.

mitted to convene, with their wives and daughters, "in large and promiscuous assemblies" to listen to "Anti-Slavery Orators"—as they evidently seem inclined to do—just as certainly as they are allowed to witness "the exhibition of abstract *truth* applied to *unquestionable fact*"—just so certainly will the great majority of them become Abolitionists, notwithstanding "the opinions of citizens in Boston." Neither city *mobs* composed of "gentlemen of property and standing," nor city "*meetings*," composed of the same materials, are "indicative of the feelings of the people at large." And nothing short of the strong arm of law will silence the "village and country inhabitants." The only remaining question is whether even *that* would be sufficient. Mr. T. R. Sullivan thinks it would. It is not probable, he thinks, that *many* would venture to unite with the Anti-Slavery leaders "in advocating abstract principle in such a manner as to expose themselves to the cognizance and penalties of the laws of the land!"—"It is not probable" that they will *remember* that they possess the '*inalienable right*' of meeting together, with their families, in "thronged assemblies" to hear "abstract *truth* applied to *unquestionable fact*"! "Probably" they do not *know* that they have any rights which are not graciously vouchsafed to them by the "laws of the land." "Probably" the "political class books" of our young republicans have *made no mention* of such rights, so that they are entirely forgotten, and buried in the graves of their pilgrim fathers!—"Probably" "the people at large" are aware how dangerous it would be to the "Union of the States" and especially to the "legal property and constitutional rights of thousands of our countrymen" if they should be allowed, by "the laws of the land" to be "too much" influenced by "intelligent and virtuous woman." "Probably" they will understand that if the "Anti-Slavery Orators" are permitted to make "impressions on the susceptible mind of woman" the "seeds of sectional prejudice and hostility" will strike such deep root in their own minds that neither the mobs, nor the "meetings," nor the "opinions of citizens in Boston" will ever be able to eradicate or subdue them! "Probably," therefore, they will consent to relinquish, for themselves and their families, "the liberty to know, to utter, to argue freely, according to conscience"—the liberty which Milton prized "above all liberties."

"*Village and country inhabitants*," what say you? *Is it probable?*

But Mr. T. R. Sullivan claims a particularly intimate acquaintance with the political institutions of our "*free country*"! In what "*political class book*" he has studied them, he does not inform us, though a Yankee may be permitted to *guess*. Hear his professions.

"If I have any advantage over another, justifying the strong and almost irresistible impulse which now hurries on my thoughts with a rapidity far outstripping my pen, it is that my attention has been particularly drawn to the spirit of our republican institutions" &c.

A little further on, he speaks of New England as a place where

—"every man claims freedom to think, speak, and act for the public, and every other man admits his claim, and hears with patience every thing he says worth hearing, and to the purpose, however thread bare his coat or mean his dwelling, or small his tax."

In another paragraph,

"It is not denied that these men [the Abolitionists] have, legally, the right to assemble their fellow citizens and address them in any mode that they will hear or bear."

The right of speaking "*whether* men will hear or forbear," does not seem to have occurred to Mr. T. R. Sullivan. And yet the rights which he *does* concede to Abolitionists, in these paragraphs, may seem difficult to reconcile with the general scope of his work, which is to show the necessity of "legislative enactments" to *prohibit* their exercise. If "every man claims freedom to think, speak, and act for the public" and if Abolitionists "have legally the right to assemble their fellow citizens and address them," what "power" have the "legislatures of the non-slaveholding states to enact laws" to prevent "the holding of meetings to discuss slavery and abolition."

If we understand the author, he only means to concede that, according to the *existing laws*, "every man claims freedom to think, speak, and act for the public."—that under sanction of those laws—abolitionists "*have*," at the present time, "legally, the right to assemble their fellow citizens." He evidently advocates a change of the laws in this particular; and when his object shall have been accomplish-

ed, *then* "every man" will NOT "claim freedom to think, speak, and act for the public"—and Abolitionists will NOT "have the right, legally, to assemble their fellow citizens and address them." No. Far otherwise. "There would be something more serious to contend with, than public sentiment," and "it is not probable, that they would long persist, nor obtain many to unite with them, or adhere to them, in advocating abstract principles in such a manner as to expose themselves to the cognizance and penalties of the laws of the land." We should judge that the author's knowledge of "the spirit of our republican institutions" was acquired by the perusal of some "Political Class Book" that was silent in respect to all the rights of man which are not graciously conferred by the "laws of the land." And it seems more than "probable" that he does not recognize any "inalienable human rights" of which "intelligent and virtuous woman" should be accounted a partaker. On this subject he affects to quote the Apostle Paul. "Let the woman learn in silence and subjection." How does Mr. Sullivan know the "eight hundred factory girls" *did not* learn in this manner?

But we must proceed. Our author, in his fourth letter, undertakes to show "the impropriety and inefficacy of popular excitement, as the instrument of moral, legal, and political reform, especially when strengthened by the power of combination." He proceeds to say:—"The history of the temperance reformation in this country furnishes an example in point." He professes to approve what he calls the original temperance movement against the "*excessive* use of *ardent* spirit, *as a drink*." "Entire abstinence from using and offering ardent spirit, as a drink" he considers "the true remedy; and "never was a better cause, never was a good cause better begun."

Well: what was the matter, Mr. Sullivan?

"Why, in the first place—"The temperance societies left off acting upon others not members and the community at large, *as individuals*, and began to act as *societies or combinations*—the reform which began with individual persuasion, came then to be prosecuted by numerical influence."

Indeed! When, and how was this change introduced! But what next?

"The next modification of the original step was to add to ardent spirit 'wine, strong beer, cordials, cider' &c. to be included in the pledge of total abstinence!"

Rather a hard case, to be sure, Mr. Sullivan ; but "the opinions of citizens in Boston"—you know—"do not necessarily represent those of the village and country inhabitants." And the fanatical ultra temperance lecturers were much in the habit of addressing "thronged assemblies composed chiefly of females" in manufacturing towns, among "factory girls" and "the people at large." And the city "meetings called in contravention of these increasing influences—could not act upon the minds of those not present at such meetings as an antidote to exciting appeals to the multitude, 'man, woman, and child,' by ardent and sincere philanthropists." [Preface, p. 1.] And so the anti-wine-and-beer doctrines prevailed—much to the chagrin of "gentlemen of property and standing" in great cities.

But what was the next alarming innovation of the temperance ultras?

"Bringing popular feeling to bear directly upon the manufacturer, and dealer, instead of confining direct and joint action to the reformation of the consumer or buyer." "I object to the direct action of temperance societies upon the character and employment of the manufacturer and the dealer (such as voting not to trade with them for other things, or not to keep or receive them in the church) considered as a means of promoting the temperance reformation, or of putting a stop to their several occupations."

Undoubtedly the author is *consistent* in introducing these objections to the course of the temperance reformation. These things as "immediately affect the legal property, the personal security, the domestic customs, of thousands of our citizens" as any thing that is done by Abolitionists, and as seriously call for "legislative enactments" for their suppression. But the opportunity has probably gone by. "The people at large" were not seasonably forbidden to hear the arguments against 'wine, beer, and cider,' and so "the citizens in Boston" must make the best use of their experience they can ; and take things in time, when they find the "general population" inclined to go counter to their wishes.

Mr. Sullivan proceeds to inform us that the *genuine* temperance reformation went forward with as much rapidity as could be desired—until these departures from the original system. But *now* the movement is "retrograde!"—This will probably be *news* to Mr. Delavan, and the active conductors of the temperance reformation, whose abundant statistics have uniformly led them to a contrary conclusion

We are likewise reminded of the speech of an equally intelligent Boston lawyer, at a temperance meeting in that city, in the summer of 1829. He assured his hearers that the only way to promote the temperance cause was to adhere to the moderate drinking principle, on which the Massachusetts Society for the suppression of intemperance was originally founded, in 1812. Experience, he said, had now abundantly proved that a reaction was produced, and the cause injured by the attempts that had been made to introduce the extravagant notion of total abstinence from ardent spirit, as a drink ! "Citizens in Boston" were as generally on his side of the question then, as they are on the side of Mr. Sullivan now, but they could not act on the minds of those "who were not present at such meetings."

Our author complains much that *liberty of action* is infringed by the compulsory measures of the temperance combinations.

"Thus it was urged upon every individual, (in some cases including children under ten years of age,) under penalty of the ban of public displeasure, to give up his freedom of action and right of self-direction, to an extent which the community is not entitled to exact, and to which no man is under obligation to consent."

And this is the writer who, *on this very ground* of complaint against ultra reformers, contends that the *community is entitled to exact* of THEM a relinquishment of freedom of speech and of the press !

The amount of the argument is this. Reformers, if permitted to address "large audiences, two thirds of which are females," among our "village and country inhabitants" "at large," have been found to get up such a withering public sentiment against *vice*, that there is no such thing as standing it out, comfortably, against them. They "compel men, by the force of united influence and of public feeling, to relinquish more of their liberty of action, than, through individual persuasion, they would deliberately have done." This is the *evil*, as stated by our author.—What is his remedy ? Why, a very simple one. These Reformers must be forbidden, "by legislative enactments," from operating in this manner ! THEIR "freedom of speech and of the press" must be given up, because its exercise brings such a weight of *compulsory* public indignation upon the vicious ! Therefore they must be *compelled* to desist. *Virtue* must be compelled into silence, by the strong arm of the law, lest *vice*

should be subjected to the terrible persecution of being put to shame by a virtuous public opinion ! No wonder the influence of "virtuous and intelligent woman" is cited by our author, as one of the indications of an evil requiring legislative interference.

Mr. Sullivan does not leave us in doubt, in respect to the application of the lesson he has learned from "the history of the temperance reformation."—Hear him

"This chapter of *collateral history*—to the truth of which hundreds of discerning minds throughout New England will testify—affords a *fair illustration* of the principle of anti-slavery operations in the northern states, viz: the power of popular excitement, strengthened by combination ; and as like causes produce like effects, the same tendency is seen in the latter case as in the former, viz: in the injustice practised by the immediate abolitionists of denouncing whole classes of men, of indulging in unqualified condemnation, and of founding unfair conclusions upon inaccurate or exaggerated statements, as well as in the proofs, every day growing clearer, that by their compulsory doings (for violence is compulsory in debate as well as in action,) they are using means, suited to increase the misery they wish to relieve, and retard the cause they hope to serve."

¶ We are here plainly told that the "*principle* of the anti-slavery operations" is the same with that of the temperance operations, which the author describes, and which now generally prevail, wherever temperance measures are efficiently carried forward at all. The temperance operations are cited on purpose to "illustrate" the mischievous principles and tendencies of anti-slavery measures, and show that they ought to be suppressed by "legal enactments." The inference is evident and unavoidable. Legal enactments, according to our author, *should* have been resorted to, in season to prevent the evils of the temperance operations of which he complains ! And he points to those evils as to a warning beacon which admonishes the community to silence "the anti-slavery orators" before their efforts shall have occasioned equally deplorable results ! We feel thankful for this full and open disclosure. To the *public* it may be of essential service. For ourselves, we have had ample occasion to know that the opposition to anti-slavery operations, which seeks their legislative suppression, is by no means more virulent—and in some respects it is more honorable—than that by which thorough temperance measures were, for a long time, counteracted by gentlemen in high standing, and enjoying the almost unbounded confidence of the friends of temperance and religion.

"The general population of the northern states" cannot

fail to admire the palliation of European despotism, which is introduced by our author in illustration of the parallel excuse, he urges on behalf of the slaveholder.

"The laws and customs of the slaveholders are not without extenuation, * * * and the palliation may be admissible for the southern slaveholder, that Voltaire bespoke for Peter the Great, when in reference to some rigorous punishments inflicted by that monarch, he said—'However shocking these severities appear to us, they were perhaps, *necessary*, in a country where the support of the laws seem to require a tremendous rigor.' Some degree of rigor may always be *necessarily* connected with slavery," &c.

We come now to the letter of WILLIAM SULLIVAN, L. L. D. containing his legal opinion on the great question of legislation against anti-slavery publications and anti-slavery meetings. The literary standing of the writer, and more especially the fact that a "Political Class Book" from his pen, is chiefly relied upon to give the rising generation just views of their rights and duties as American citizens, confers additional interest on his performance on the present occasion.

The questions are stated as follows :

1. "Has the legislature of Massachusetts power to prohibit, under penalties, the publishing of papers and pamphlets tending to instigate slaves, *who are beyond the limits of the state*, to acts of insurrection and violence?"
2. "Has this legislature power to prohibit under any, and what penalties, assemblies to hear arguments and speeches, intended to cause general and immediate emancipation of slaves?"

It is plain that the affirmative of the *first* question might be maintained without touching any one of the anti-slavery "papers and pamphlets," upon any fair and candid construction. But the constant practice of taking for granted the opposite accusation as a fact, and the manner in which this is done in the present instance, diminishes nothing from the virulence of the thrust, which it covers, against civil and religious freedom.

"Pamphlets" says Dr. Sullivan, "are said to be printed, sent, and circulated in slaveholding states, designed to teach slaves, that they have a right to freedom paramount to all bondage arising from usage and human laws."

They are not designed to teach slaves *any* thing; they are neither written *for* them, nor sent *to* them. But supposing they were? And supposing they did teach what is here attributed to them—would that be equivalent to "instigating the slaves to insurrection and acts of violence?" Far from it. Men may be taught their rights, without being

taught to defend them by acts of bloodshed. But Dr. Sullivan seems to speak of the two things as synonymous, and he gives us to understand distinctly that our complaints of injustice, and protestations of innocence are to avail us nothing !

Is it not *true* that "the slave has a right to freedom, paramount to all bondage arising from usage and human laws?" And is the utterance of this truth, to be accounted a crime, in Massachusetts? Certainly, according to the decision of Dr. Sullivan. And anti-slavery meetings are accounted equally criminal.—Hear him :

"It is to be HOPED and EXPECTED, that Massachusetts will enact laws, declaring the printing, publishing and circulating papers and pamphlets on slavery ; and also the HOLDING OF MEETINGS TO DISCUSS slavery and abolition, to be public, indictable offences, and provide for the punishment thereof, in such a manner as will most effectually prevent such offences."

It is not the mere circulation of anti-slavery publications, *at the south*, after all, that is to be prohibited in Massachusetts. No.—Mr. T. R. Sullivan gave the *honest* account of the matter in his preface. It is among "the village and country inhabitants of the northern states," and *not* the slaves of the south, that the "increasing influences" of "abolition orators" is feared.—Why else the prohibition of anti-slavery meetings recommended by the "legal opinion" of Dr. William Sullivan?

But let us look at the process of reasoning, by which the learned counsellor and guardian of republican education has arrived at his conclusion. A short extract will give us a clue to his logic.

"In attempting to answer these questions, I shall not enter at all into the inquiry whether slavery is, or is not, prohibited by natural or divine law. So far as I am able to comprehend the meaning of these laws, (entertaining the highest respect for the one, and habitual veneration for the other,) I think neither of them are to be taken into view, in answering your questions. Human laws made by a whole people, for their own security and happiness, and which every one is expressly, or impliedly, bound by oath to obey, are the laws and the only laws, by which these questions must be answered, whatever may become of *speculations* on natural or divine law. The Constitution of the United States, that of Massachusetts, the statutes made under the authority of these, the statutes in force in other states of the union, (so far as the citizens of this state are bound to respect them,) are laws which give place to no other laws, because no citizen is *at liberty* to treat them as contrary to divine law, while he is a citizen, and these laws are in force."

No language could be more explicit than this. And no position could more effectually prostrate the divine law, before the paramount authority of man. There must be something peculiarly sacred, and *more* than divine, in "the Constitutions of the United States and of Massachusetts," or else every citizen of every government under heaven is under obligation to obey men rather than God, in the same manner.—No citizen *is at liberty* to judge whether the laws of God are contrary to the laws of the land or not! A more perfect superstructure of civil despotism was never reared on earth, or can be conceived by the human mind!

By casting away the cords of divine law, in the outset, our writer finds his course comparatively smooth and easy.—The constitution sanctions *slavery*. Its guarantee of *freedom* of speech and of the press is left out of the argument. The Southern States have a right to enact their own laws—and *Northern* citizens—so it would seem—are bound by them—or else the Union will be dissolved. The States [i. e. the *Southern* States] are Sovereign; and *therefore* the *Northern* States [*query*—are *they* Sovereign?] are bound to enact such laws as the *Southern* States may deem necessary for their protection! This is the substance of the argument in the course of which the writer introduces the following illustration.

"Suppose the *Peace Societies* of France should be of opinion, in their zeal to improve the world, that all wars are forbidden by natural and divine laws; that, as the British debt was mostly contracted in carrying on wars, justice forbids the payment of the principal or interest. Suppose pamphlets were printed in France and circulated in England, counselling English subjects to resist all taxation to pay interest on that debt. Suppose England remonstrated, and France would not pass prohibitory laws; no man can doubt that a justifiable cause of war would have arisen."^{*}

The intended parallel fails, in several important particulars. Abolitionists do not address their pamphlets to the *oppressed*, nor give them any counsel, much less that of *resistance*. Other striking dissimilarities exist. But no matter. It is instructive to see that even the *Peace Society*, as well as the Anti-Slavery Society, and the temperance effort

^{*} This argument strikes deep against Christian missions. Idol worship is interwoven with the political institutions of Asia. And the Burman Emperor according to Dr. Wm. Sullivan, has a justifiable cause of war with America, unless she forbids missions to that empire! "Why do the heathen rage?" &c.

is deemed disorganizing and "incendiary" by those who dread the "increasing influence" with "the people at large."

But the learned counsellor proceeds to cite other authorities in favor of the proposed measure.

"This matter," says he "is put beyond question by several cases in England sufficiently analogous to be in point. These cases show that acts done in England, concerning persons beyond English jurisdiction are offences against the laws of England."

And what if the fact be so? The question was *not* what the laws of an European monarchy *are*, but what the laws of an American Republic *ought* to be! The counsellor seems to forget himself, and imagine that he is at the bar of the Court, citing the "Common law" of the "dark ages," for the government of Americans of the nineteenth century, a species of "foreign interference"—by the by—far more dangerous to the liberties of "the people at large" than the speeches of Thompson and O'Connell in favor of freedom! But "the opinion of citizens in Boston" have never been remarkably adverse to "foreigners" except when their voices have been raised against despotism!

To return:—

"George Lord Gordon was twice convicted in England, for libelling the French Ambassador and the Queen of France. Jean Peltier, a Frenchman who had taken refuge in England, was convicted of libelling Bonaparte. John Vint was indicted in England for a libel on the Emperor Paul of Russia, and was convicted and sentenced. The words charged as libellous were: The Emperor of Russia, is rendering himself obnoxious to his subjects, by various acts of tyranny, and ridiculous in the eyes of Europe by his inconsistency. He has lately passed an act to prohibit the exportation of deals and other naval stores. In consequence of this ill-judged law, an hundred sail of vessels are likely to return to their country without freight." "This is the doctrine of the common law of England," &c.

Sufficient authority, undoubtedly!—William Sullivan, L. L. D. may hang up, in triumph, his victorious pen! He has *more* than proved his position. For since "these doctrines of the common law were brought to this country by our ancestors as their birthright, and are capable of being applied" &c. &c. it would seem that extra legislation might be spared, and "the Anti-Slavery Orators" silenced by "common law!"

The crowned despots of the 'Holy Alliance' do not permit their subjects to charge any member of the confederacy with tyranny. It would endanger their 'glorious union.'

And so the aristocratic "citizens in Boston" must not permit "the village and country inhabitants" to assemble and hear any charges of tyranny against their confederate brethren of the South! The parallel is fairly made out, we confess; and the disposition is not wanting, to carry it into execution. But whether "the opinions of citizens in Boston" will represent "the feelings of the people at large"—that is the question to be settled. And the case cited by Dr. William Sullivan presents powerful attractions—for those who have the appetite to relish them!

Will not "the general population of the Northern States" be convinced of the propriety of enacting laws which shall render it an "*indictable offence*" for any of them, (especially in company with their daughters, whether "factory girls" or "boarding school misses") to "hold meetings to discuss slavery and abolition?" Do they not consider the "sufficiently analogous" case of John Vint of England, who was convicted for a libel on the august "Emperor of Russia"? Will they not reflect how improper it would be—and what a "just cause of war" it would occasion—to *permit* any American to say that the Emperor of Russia is a tyrant?—Will they not readily assent to a law which shall make it an "*indictable offence*" for any of "the village and country inhabitants" to attend a meeting in favor of the Greeks, where the Turkish Sultan is arraigned—or in favor of the Poles, where the "Emperor of Russia" is denounced as "a tyrant"—or in favor of one sixth part of their fellow Americans, whose plunderers are audaciously called thieves and robbers? Has not "Dr. William Sullivan, counsellor at law, illustrated these "sufficiently analogous cases" and certified "the opinions of citizens in Boston"?

Enough of the "LETTERS" and the "LEGAL OPINION" of the Messrs. Sullivans. Can it be possible that our republic is *prepared* for the reception of such "doctrines"? From what writers are our schools supplied with moral and political instruction? Let us inquire. A volume lies before us. What is it?

II. THE POLITICAL CLASS BOOK, &c. &c. BY WILLIAM SULLIVAN L. L. D. And so the author of the "Legal Opinion" is the *Lycurgus* of our young republicans (!) "in Boston." We will notice, in the first place, a few things which

the book *does* contain ; and then glance, very briefly at some things which it does *not* contain.

"One who desires to have our country ruled by a *democracy*, and one who desires to have it ruled by a *monarchy*, may be said to be *equally at variance* with our forms of government." p. 17.

Remark. An *aristocracy* is naturally at war with *both* monarch and people. Let *history* be enquired of, in this matter.

"There *cannot* be a monopoly in *this* country, though it is not uncommon in Europe." p. 80.

Some of our "village and country inhabitants"—particularly at the South (!), will be glad to be certified of so pleasing a fact !

"There are prescribed rules which must be observed, to enable one to become a member of the learned professions. * * * A man ought not to take upon himself the responsibility of expounding the scriptures * * * unless he carries unquestionable credentials" &c. * * * It is wisely and properly *required* that there should be an *authority*, somewhere, *enabled to grant* the necessary credentials. *The schools of divinity*, and the learned who preside there, *have the authority* to grant them." p. 130.

From whence "the authority" is derived, our author does not inform us : but the statement in a "Political Class Book" carries the idea that the "authority" is a part of our political institutions, and is comprised "in the origin, nature, and use of political power," concerning which the "Class Book" treats. The information may be novel to our "village and country inhabitants"—but when the "Class Book" shall have been in use half a century, the position will, perhaps, become "a doctrine of common law," and be cited as a foundation for "legal enactments."

"There is now no civil and religious union in this state [Massachusetts,] *other-wise* than that it is the duty of the legislature to provide for religious instruction" That this duty *should* be performed, [i. e. by the legislature,] may be shown in many ways : " &c. page 139.

When the state wishes to prohibit Christian reproofs of oppression by "legal enactments," she will find it requisite to cherish an intimate union with a church whose "priests love to have it so," that the "wicked" may "bear rule by their means."—The "political power" of providing religious instruction, and granting credentials to ministers of the gospel, will be amply sufficient for their purposes.

The "Political Class Book" enters much into a minute detail of legal forms and *facts*. In these respects it may be useful, to a certain extent. But it is deplorably deficient in sound republican *principles*. And while it gives us the French or Latin etymology of almost every legal term and civil title, while all the forms of arrests, complaints and pleadings, with very particular specifications of the official duties of various public servants, are furnished us, we search in vain, not *only* for the *fundamental principles*, but for the *prominent* and *leading facts* in the inventory of our *freedom*! The *mode* of empanelling juries is stated with the apparent accuracy of a county court clerk, but when and why *every* citizen has a *right* to trial by jury we are not informed. There is not much reason to wonder at such omission when we reflect that Mr. Sullivan considers government rather as a machine for *regulating the rights* of the people, than as an institution growing out of those rights, and designed only for their protection. "The fundamental principle of society," he says, "is this; that the wants and *rights* of each member shall be *regulated* by the rights and wants of every other." How far the wants are to regulate the rights, is a question into which the Class Book does not enter. It seems to be left open to the government!

Again, the rights of individuals, it would seem from Dr. Sullivan, are not only subject to regulation by "society," but they are "fruits of society." Society is the author of them—"its breath can make them as its breath hath made"—and consequently it can *unmake* them. Thus does the learned counsellor reason on the subject:—"It appears that among the first *fruits of society* is the *right* of property;—that is, that each individual may lawfully acquire, possess and use all things which are necessary, convenient, and agreeable, to him, excluding possession and use by all other persons, unless with his consent. Society is said to be the best which human condition permits, in proportion as each member of it is free to use his faculties, in obtaining the means of happiness, without disturbing others, who are using their faculties to the like end; and when each member is protected by fixed, equal and just laws, faithfully and

* What follows is added by the editor, the last leaf of Mr. Goodell's MS. having been unfortunately lost at a period too late to be replaced.

impartially administered." Now, an important question may arise, Who are members of society? The youthful reader may need, if he does not desire, to be told, whether society includes, as members, all the *human beings* that live under its power; whether it *confers* upon "all men" the right of property, or, whether membership itself is a fruit of society. It may be, for aught he can learn in the "Political Class Book," that human beings themselves do sometimes fall into the condition of *property*. If it is society that *gives* a man the *right* to use the products of his own faculties, why may not society, for its own reasons, withhold the *gift*? Why may it not bestow upon some men the right to use the faculty of others?

Whether our great men, who are now so anxious to cleave down the genius of American liberty have been warily engaged in corrupting the republican simplicity of our youth, they themselves best know. But thanks to the Anti-Slavery excitement, whatever may have been their designs, their premature disclosure of the last act to which their previous teachings have naturally tended, will open the eyes of "the village and country inhabitants," at least, to the necessity of a different system of instruction.

STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES' SLAVE POPULATION.

BY THE EDITOR.

It is commonly supposed that the slavery of the United States is not, like that of the West India sugar colonies, eminently destructive to human life. By many it is thought to be rather friendly to man, as a mere animal. A careful inspection of the census will show this to be a mistake. It will show a system by which nature's geometric power of increase is brought into full play to create a *supply* of life adequate to an enormously enhanced *consumption*. It will reveal some of the secrets of the internal slave trade, and indicate with certainty a catastrophe, to which we are approaching.

To place the necessary data before the reader, we give, first, a synopsis of the slave and free colored population, with the ratio of slaves to free whites in 1820 and 1830.

Slave, Free White, and Free Colored Population.—No. 1.

States and Territories.	Slaves. 1790.	Slaves. 1800.	Slaves. 1810.	Slaves. 1820.	Slaves. 1830.	Free Whites. 1820.	Free Whites. 1830.	Ratio of Slaves to F. Whites. 1820.	Ratio of Slaves to F. Whites. 1830.	Free Colored. 1790.	Free Colored. 1800.	Free Colored. 1810.	Free Colored. 1820.	Free Colored. 1830.
Maine,	6	297,406	398,260	0	Less than 1 per cent.	538	818	969	929	1,171
N. Hampshire,	158	8	5	243,375	268,721	0	630	856	970	786	602
Vermont,	17	234,861	279,776	0	0	255	557	750	903	881
Massachusetts,	4	516,547	603,359	0	Less than 1 per cent.	5,463	6,452	6,737	6,740	7,045
Rhode Island,	952	281	108	48	14	79,491	93,261	Less than 1 per cent.	3,469	3,304	3,609	3,554	3,564
Connecticut,	2,764	951	310	97	25	267,301	289,603	2,801	5,330	6,453	7,850	8,047
New York,	21,324	20,343	15,017	10,088	76	1,333,445	1,868,061	4,654	10,374	25,333	29,279	44,869
New Jersey,	11,423	12,422	10,851	7,557	2,254	257,558	300,266	2.9	2,762	4,402	7,843	12,460	18,303
Pennsylvania,	3,737	1,706	795	211	403	1,019,040	1,309,900	Less than 1 per cent.	6,537	14,561	22,492	30,202	37,930
Ohio,	6	576,711	928,329	327	1,899	4,723	9,563
Indiana,	135	237	190	3	145,758	339,399	163	393	1,230	3,629
Illinois,	168	917	747	53,837	155,061	613	457	1,637
Michigan,	24	32	8,722	31,346	120	174	261
Tot. in F. States,	40,375	35,946	27,510	19,108	3,575	5,034,052	6,865,342	27,109	47,164	78,181	99,257	137,507
Delaware,	8,887	6,153	4,177	4,509	3,292	55,282	57,601	8.1	5.7	3,899	5,265	13,136	12,958	15,855
Maryland,	103,036	105,635	111,502	107,398	102,994	260,222	291,108	41.2	35.3	8,043	19,587	33,927	39,730	52,938
Dis. of Columbia	3,244	5,395	6,377	6,119	22,614	27,563	28.2	22.2	783	2,549	4,048	6,152
Virginia,	293,427	345,796	392,518	425,153	469,757	603,324	694,300	70.4	67.6	12,766	20,124	30,570	36,889	47,348
N. Carolina,	100,572	133,296	168,824	205,017	245,601	419,200	472,843	48.9	52	4,975	7,043	10,266	14,612	19,543
S. Carolina,	107,004	146,151	196,365	258,475	315,401	237,440	257,863	109	122.3	1,801	3,185	4,554	6,826	7,921
Georgia,	29,264	59,404	105,218	149,656	217,531	189,570	296,806	78.9	73.3	398	1,019	1,801	1,763	2,486
Kentucky,	11,830	40,343	80,561	126,732	165,213	434,826	517,787	29.1	31.9	114	741	1,713	2,759	4,917
Tennessee,	3,417	13,584	44,535	80,107	141,603	339,979	535,746	23.3	26.4	361	309	1,317	2,727	4,555
Alabama,	41,879	117,549	85,451	190,406	49	61.7	571	1,572
Mississippi,	3,489	17,088	32,814	65,659	42,171	70,443	77.8	93.2	182	240	458	519
Louisiana,	34,660	69,064	109,588	73,383	89,231	93.9	122.8	7,585	10,960	16,710
Missouri,	3,011	10,222	25,091	55,757	114,795	18.3	21.8	607	347	569
Arkansas,	1,617	4,576	12,570	25,671	12.8	17.8	59	141
Florida,	15,501	18,385	84.3	844
Total S. States,	657,437	857,095	1,163,854	1,519,020	2,005,475	2,831,789	3,660,548	53.6	54.7	32,357	61,241	108,265	134,707	182,070
Grand Total,	697,812	893,041	1,191,364	1,538,128	2,009,050	7,865,841	10,525,890	19.5	19	59,466	108,395	186,446	233,994	319,577

The ratio of the aggregate increase of the slaves in the slave states from 1820 to 1830 was 2.8 per cent. per annum; if we compare the increase of individual states with the increase by this ratio, we shall have the following result:—

Loss from 1820 to 1830, in		GAIN in the same time, in	
Delaware, - - -	2,661	Georgia, - - -	19,949
Maryland, - - -	38,797	Tennessee, - - -	35,842
District of Columbia, -	2,300	Alabama, - - -	62,259
Virginia, - - -	91,549	Mississippi, - - -	22,337
North Carolina, - - -	25,071	Louisiana, - - -	18,407
South Carolina, - - -	25,849	Missouri, - - -	11,595
Kentucky, - - -	2,104	Arkansas, - - -	2,441
	188,331	Florida, - - -	15,501*
			188,331

Thus in 10 years were 188,331 slaves transferred from the northeast to the southwest. A part of this transfer is due to emigration, but another cause will be shown by the following tables.

No. II.

PARTICULARS OF COLORED POPULATION IN 1830.

DISTRICTS.		AGES.					
		Under 10.	Of 10 and under 24.	Of 24 and under 36.	Of 36 and under 55.	Of 55 and under 100.	Over 100.
SLAVES.	Delaware,	1,088	1,470	475	163	91	5
	Maryland,	34,882	33,995	17,177	11,464	5,373	103
	Dist. of Columbia,	1,610	2,294	1,154	766	290	5
	Eastern Virginia,	147,824	118,648	75,073	52,179	22,340	256
	Western Virginia,	19,383	17,190	9,043	5,710	2,090	21
	North Carolina,	90,838	75,607	40,307	27,118	11,484	247
	South Carolina,	103,344	90,117	62,399	43,680	15,679	182
	Georgia,	76,469	68,170	39,967	25,143	7,612	170
	Kentucky,	62,475	54,795	27,374	15,606	4,852	111
	Eastern Tennessee,	6,675	6,256	2,755	1,616	570	15
	Western Tennessee,	47,606	41,320	20,728	10,923	3,050	89
	Alabama,	43,223	39,222	22,188	10,056	2,807	53
	Mississippi,	21,897	21,634	13,930	6,628	1,527	43
	Eastern Louisiana,	18,888	25,146	22,443	11,003	2,905	60
	Western Louisiana,	8,426	9,393	6,875	3,689	736	24
	Missouri,	9,483	8,969	4,257	1,937	427	18
	Arkansas,	1,648	1,650	794	355	98	1
	Florida,	5,061	4,951	3,391	1,716	401	1
	TOTAL,	700,820	620,827	370,330	229,782	82,332	1,404
	New-Jersey,	13	32	819	834	549	7
	Pennsylvania,	55	208	47	36	52	5
	Illinois,	242	246	137	99	18	5
FREE.	Delaware,	5,151	4,618	2,749	2,282	1,029	26
	Maryland,	16,221	13,412	9,409	8,677	5,083	136
	United States.	96,004	91,217	60,191	46,598	24,934	655

* A part of these were received with the territory, but the error is not material.

No. III.

ADULTS RELATIVE TO A GIVEN NUMBER OF CHILDREN,
DERIVED FROM NO. II.

DISTRICTS.		AGES.				
		Under 10.	Of 10 and under 24.	Of 24 and under 36.	Of 36 and under 55.	Of 55 and under 100.
SLAVES.	Delaware,	10,000	13,511	4,366	1,498	836
	Maryland,	10,000	9,746	4,924	3,264	1,540
	Dist. of Columbia,	10,000	14,248	7,168	4,758	1,801
	Eastern Virginia,	10,000	8,026	5,079	3,530	1,511
	Western Virginia,	10,000	8,869	4,665	2,946	1,078
	North Carolina,	10,000	8,323	4,437	2,985	1,264
	South Carolina,	10,000	8,720	6,038	4,227	1,517
	Georgia,	10,000	8,915	5,227	3,288	995
	Kentucky,	10,000	8,770	4,282	2,498	777
	Eastern Tennessee,	10,000	9,372	4,127	2,421	854
	Western Tennessee,	10,000	8,680	4,354	2,294	641
	Alabama,	10,000	9,074	5,133	2,327	649
	Mississippi,	10,000	9,880	6,376	3,027	697
	Eastern Louisiana,	10,000	13,313	11,882	5,825	1,538
	Western Louisiana,	10,000	11,148	8,159	4,378	873
	Missouri,	10,000	9,458	4,489	2,043	450
	Arkansas,	10,000	10,012	4,818	2,336	595
	Florida,	10,000	9,783	6,700	3,391	792
	AVERAGE of above,	10,000	8,859	5,284	3,279	1,175
	Illinois,	10,000	10,165	5,661	4,091	744
FREE.	Delaware,	10,000	8,965	5,337	4,430	1,998
	Maryland,	10,000	8,268	5,801	5,349	3,134
	United States,	10,000	9,501	6,270	4,854	2,597

It is unfortunate for our purpose that the census includes in the same class slaves from 10 to 24 years of age, nevertheless, a glance at the latter table will show a great excess of adults at the southwest, and, with exceptions rather apparent than real, a corresponding deficiency at the northeast. In regard to slaves between the ages of 10 and 36, the actual deviation from the average is as follows:—

EXCESS.		DEFICIENCY.	
Delaware,	406	Virginia,	16,523
Maryland,	1,838	North Carolina,	12,556
District of Columbia,	1,171	Kentucky,	6,189
South Carolina,	6,357	Tennessee,	5,709
Alabama,	279	Missouri,	186
Mississippi,	4,597	Georgia,	13
Louisiana,	25,230		
Florida,	1,185		
Arkansas,	113		
	41,176		41,176

This immense disturbance of the natural state of the slave population could not have been produced by emigra-

tion. We do not pretend that it is the exact measure of the internal slave trade, it is far short of that. For, every child born in Louisiana, Mississippi, or South Carolina, of slaves brought into the state between 1820 and 1830 diminishes the excess, while, on the other hand, the removal from Maryland or Virginia of those who would have been parents there, in the same time, tends to hide the deficiency in those states. Indeed if the slave trade be excessive, the consequent want of young children will make an apparent excess of adults in the slave selling states, which explains the excess in Delaware and Maryland, states that have sold more slaves for their population than any others.

The slaves, though they increase a little faster than the whites in the slave states, do not increase so fast as the whites in the whole country. The ratio of increase is the ratio of deaths less the ratio of births. The ratio of children under 10 must be nearly the same as the ratio of births. Now, there are 47,134 slave children under 10 more than there should be by the ratio of white children of the same age to the whole white population. Consequently the ratio of deaths must be much greater than among the whites, to make that of increase less. And, this too, while the colored are so much more *long-lived* than the whites that, of the free colored people in 1830, there were 655 over 100, while of the whites there were only 539.

Again, the waste of life is shown by comparing the slave population with what it would be by the ratio of the free colored, the number of children being given :—

	Under 10.	Of 10 and under 24.	Of 24 and under 36.	Of 36 and under 55.	Of 55 and under 100.	Over 100.
Ratio of Free Col'd.	700,820	665,875	439,389	340,161	182,016	4,781
Actual Slave Pop.	700,820	620,827	370,330	229,782	82,332	1,404
Deficiency.		45,048	69,059	110,379	99,684	3,377

Total deficiency 327,547. If the ratio of free colored adults is too high by all those who had bought their freedom, it is too low by all those who had been taken off by seafaring, a much larger number, as will appear by comparing the sexes of the free colored. We affirm, then, that this deficiency represents a mass of more than 300,000 human beings, who *were prematurely WORN OUT on the cotton and sugar plantations!*

TEXAS.

BY DAVID LEE CHILD, ESQ.

THE revolt of Texas has met with much sympathy and patronage in the United States. We are aware that the case, which we are about to unfold, will quicken that sympathy, and increase that patronage with a portion of our countrymen, yet it is fully believed that it will fill others, and far the larger part, with surprise and abhorrence. Hitherto not a word has been published by the press of this free country except from the aggressive party, who have committed treason against a government, which they have again and again acknowledged to be liberal, just and mild; and who must, to a greater or less extent, pay the forfeit of their lives, if not enabled by the aid of the people of the United States, to triumph in a protracted and bloody war. It is manifest, that any evidence from a party so situated, ought to be received with much distrust.

During the last ten years, some thirty or forty thousand persons have removed, chiefly from the slave states and territories of the United States, to Texas, a country forming with Coahuila one of the states of the Mexican republic. Their reception has been hospitable and liberal beyond example. Land has been given to them, they have been exempted from taxes and duties during ten years on the one hand, and protected by a high tariff against foreign competition in the markets for their produce on the other; they have the unprecedented indulgence of legal proceedings in their *own language*, a matter into which national punctilio might be expected to enter; and they have enjoyed as perfect, civil and religious liberty, as it seems possible for human institutions to secure. We will for the satisfaction of the doubting, quote two or three out of a great number of authorities, which we might adduce in proof of these positions.

From a letter of David G. Burrnet, formerly of New-Jersey, now a Judge in Texas, to the Trustees of the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company. 1830.

"No country promises a more ample remuneration to the industry of the inhabitants than this, and the laws of none

hold forth a stronger protection to the labor of respectable emigrants."

From the Arkansas Gazette. 1830.

"Perhaps no hopes can be entertained of *acquiring Texas, until the people shall throw off the yoke of allegiance to the Mexican government*, which they will no doubt do as soon as they shall have a reasonable *pretext* for so doing. At present the Texians are probably subject to as few exactions or impositions as any people under the sun. Their lands are given to them, and they are exempt from taxes of every description; and enjoy many other privileges, which they could not look for under any other government."

It will increase the weight of this piece of evidence, to add that the paper is printed in the midst of the friends and neighbors, from whom about half of the American settlers of Texas have gone to their new abode.

From the Guide to Texas, a work which appears to be published under the direction of the Trustees of the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company. 1835.

"They [the inhabitants of Texas,] are perfectly free, and contented with their condition; they desire no better. It is a free republic, like that of the United States; the people choose their own rulers and make their own laws, and those laws exempt them from duties on all imported goods for their own use, and from all taxes for the support of government for ten years from their settlement. *What more can they desire?* And if they did, we know not to what government they can look with a prospect of obtaining it."

The settlers were chiefly from the contiguous and neighboring states of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and the territory of Arkansas; and, in general, *they carried slaves with them, or subsequently purchased them from the United States.*

By the Constitution of Mexico, adopted in 1824, it was provided that no person should thereafter be born or introduced a slave into the Mexican States; and that all slaves then existing should be subject to punishment only upon trial and judgment by magistrates. They were also to be paid stipulated wages, which were to go to their masters, if the slaves were employed by other persons, and to be cre-

dited to them if they continued in the employment of their masters until their respective prices, to be fixed by magistrates, were worked out. Many regulations touching food, clothing, quantity of labor, and literary and religious instruction were added. It is sufficient for the present purpose to say, that the intermediate state betwixt slavery and perfect freedom, was to be a sort of apprenticeship. The American settlers continued under these provisions, not only to hold their slaves, which *might be* lawful, but to bring in others which could not be lawful. It is understood that the general mode of evading the law was to represent the slaves to be apprentices, indented for *ninety-nine*, or a great number of years. This condition of the new laborers was analogous to that of those already existing in the country, and it does not appear, that this important modification to which it would seem that the slaves in appearance assented, was contrary to the letter of any law then existing in Mexico.

On the 15th of September, 1829, the Anniversary of Independence, and a few days after the capitulation of the Spanish expeditionary force at Tampico, President Guerrero, in conformity to an article of the Constitution, empowering him to that end, issued a decree, abolishing slavery immediately, totally, and unconditionally throughout the republic.

That decree, received with applause by the civilized world, not even excepting the United States, produced the greatest dissatisfaction among the American settlers, and they determined to resist the execution of it. Within the present year, we were informed by one of them, that he was deputed to the United States to contract for arms and ammunition for the purpose. A revolution in the general government having occurred about this time, the party in power, to avoid the embarrassment of a serious affair in that remote quarter, and perhaps also to strengthen their hands in the immediate conflict for the possession of the government, granted a dispensation of the decree so far as respected Texas. Of course the apprenticeship system was revived within that territory. But to meet the flagrant abuses, of which the emigrants were guilty, a law was enacted, that no indentures of apprenticeship, or contracts for service or labor, should be valid for more than ten years from their respective dates. Thus our American emigrants, "born

and educated in a land of liberty," found it difficult with all their ingenuity, to carry slavery into a country, which but for them was entirely free. They have therefore, with all their unrivalled physical advantages and their unprecedented political privileges, remained in an unquiet and fearful state respecting the tenure by which they held slaves, and the consequences, which might accrue to them if the government should become settled, and have leisure to look to the execution of the ordinary laws. They, however, continued to introduce slaves from the United States, and even engaged to some extent in the African slave trade by way of Cuba.

In the beginning of 1833, to relieve themselves from their apprehensions, they held a convention at St. Felipe de Austin to form a Constitution for the new State of Texas, separate from Coahuila. This convention, in point of form, was not agreeable to law. They proceeded, however, to form a constitution, and commissioned Mr. Stephen F. Austin to proceed to Mexico and request a ratification of it, and the admission of the proposed State into the Mexican Union. This Mr. Austin is the son of Moses Austin, originally of Connecticut, to whom the royal government had granted a large and fine tract of land in the central part of Texas. He died without effecting much towards possessing and enjoying the grant; but this son, above mentioned, having obtained from the republican government of Mexico a confirmation to him of the grant to his father, commenced a settlement under better auspices, which has become the leading one in the colony. The Mexican Congress rejected the application of the Texians for several reasons, but principally because they considered the object to be to establish and perpetuate slavery contrary to the national constitution, and contrary to that of the State, which prohibits slavery and the introduction of slaves under any pretence whatever. *The proposed constitution contained no provision on that subject!* Upon the failure of his mission, Austin wrote to the municipal authorities in Texas, urging them to proclaim the new constitution in spite of the general government. Without doubt he desired to precipitate the province into a rebellion for the desperate chance of obtaining thereby the blessings of slavery. The Ayuntamiento of Bejar, upon receipt of Austin's communication, adopted a declaration cen-

suring him for it, and ordered the whole subject to be referred with the documents to the governor of Coahuila and Texas, and he immediately passed them to the President of the Mexican States. Meantime Austin had left the capital to proceed homeward, but he was overtaken by a messenger of the government and arrested in the town of Saltillo on the frontiers of Texas and Coahuila, and brought back to the city. This was the occasion of that imprisonment of Austin which has elicited so much sympathy in his favor from the press of the United States. How little he merited it, this narrative sufficiently shows.

It is now necessary to look at the movements of our government. The river Sabine is the boundary between Mexico and the United States established by the Florida treaty in 1819. That treaty, if not mainly intended to gratify Georgia, was undoubtedly much hastened on her account. It was recently stated by a member of Congress of that day, a gentleman opposed to abolition,* that in a secret session of the House of Representatives on the subject of that treaty, it was stated that the President, Monroe, had received more than a hundred and fifty letters from inhabitants of Georgia, residing near the Florida line, declaring that their slaves ran away in such numbers, and found an asylum in Florida, that if the province were not obtained by treaty, the Georgians would rise and take it by force. We pass the melancholy subject of the robbery of the aborigines.

Florida was obtained, but scarcely was peaceable possession taken of it, when a longing eye was cast upon Texas. Mr. Adams, a northern President, accused by the slaveholders of having sacrificed a good claim on Texas to obtain Florida, because he was jealous of the slave states, gave way to this grasping disposition and sent a Minister Plenipotentiary, Mr. Poinsett of South Carolina, to Mexico with instructions to purchase Texas, if it could be had; and if zeal, intrigue, and taking every advantage of the intestine divisions of the country could have ensured a favorable result, there cannot be a doubt that Mr. Poinsett would have obtained the land, and "five more slave states," would have now been in rapid process of preparation for brightening the North American constellation. Fortunately there was

*Timothy Pitkin.

nothing accomplished in Mr. Adams' time in which there was certainly the most danger, from his wary and experienced diplomacy. Gen. Jackson having succeeded to the Presidency, sent off new and pressing instructions to Poinsett, in consequence of which that minister appears to have pulled the wires with an intensity, till then unknown. Then it was that his house was beset by a mob, and the American flag unfurled to protect our minister from their fury. It was duly honored by the Mexicans, and we would fain say as much of the American side of the affair. It was reported at home that Poinsett was assassinated. He had made himself the *master-mover* among the *Yorkinos*, or York Masons, a political party under the name of Freemasonry.

The Mexican people, as well as every administration for the last eight or ten years, have been not only opposed to the sale of Texas, but sorely sensitive on the subject. Their national constitution defines the limits of the national domain. These could not be altered without an alteration of the constitution. The Mexicans resented the idea of a foreigner's proposing an object, which could not be reached without breaking down and trampling upon their constitution. When it was found that they would not sell Texas, Mr. Poinsett taking advantage of an approaching invasion and of the supposed exhaustion of the treasury, proposed to loan them the sum of \$10,000,000 upon a mortgage of Texas. The Mexicans considered this a farther and grosser insult.

In the latter part of the year 1829 Poinsett was recalled, and all the information respecting these remarkable transactions, which the President has thought proper to give, or any member of Congress to call for, was a declaration in the message of that year that the imputations upon Poinsett of interference in the political concerns of Mexico were believed to be groundless! Mr. Poinsett left Mexico amidst the general execrations of the people and government.

A *Chargé de Affaires*, Col. Butler, was sent to replace him, but we understand that he has never ventured openly to propose a renewal of the negociation. In the year 1831, it had come to be well understood in the United States, that all hope of taking Texas by diplomacy was at an end. But it was said by the Southern presses, and *evidently* with the sanction, if not at the suggestion of official persons, that the

Texians would one day declare themselves independent and ask to be received into the union.

It remains now to advert briefly to the source of this extreme impatience for the annexation of Texas to our country, already so extensive. This source is deeper than mere covetousness of territory.

Slave labor ruins in a course of time every soil in the planting countries except those rare spots, which possess by nature an inexhaustible fertility. The planters know no such process as *manuring*. The maritime parts of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina are described as barren and desolate for nearly one hundred miles into the interior. Where once there was cultivation and stately mansions, are now stunted pines; and the wolf and the wild deer have literally returned to their primitive haunts. The business of *planting*, properly so called, is run out, and as farming never has borne, and never can bear, to any great extent, the expense of slave labor, the owners of slaves in the old states find themselves equally embarrassed by an impoverished soil, and a surplus of laborers. The latter rapidly increases, and new mouths are added in proportion as the means are diminished for filling them. In this state of things the planter would be compelled to emancipate or starve in the midst of his vassals. And here comes in the *American slave trade*, like a guardian genius from the regions of despair, to relieve criminals from the natural consequences of their crime, from the correctional police, established in mercy by the ruler of the universe. It comes to turn sins into gold, and to diminish the number of mouths while it increases the means of satisfying them.

Hence the fact, that Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, had become, before the year 1830, slave-exporting states, and some of them slave-raising states, i. e. *making it a business to breed slaves for the market*. Mr. Marshall, a member of the Virginia assembly, estimated the number raised and sold by that state, between the years 1820 and 1830, at 108,000; which were worth, at a moderate calculation \$32,400,000. During the same period, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Kentucky, exported as many more. This, therefore, is an interest fearfully great and increasing. Georgia, Tennessee,

and even Missouri, may now be added to the list, according to information which is reaching us from these states.

It is obvious that this immense amount of human merchandize, this "*vigintial* crop," as it was denominated by Mr. Faulkner in the Virginia assembly, must find a market; and there is no place on the globe, where *Americans*, who, by the law of God, and by that covenant with Him, which we have forsaken, should *all* be born free, can be sold like cattle, except within the limits of our own republic. It becomes necessary, therefore, for the support of this mighty iniquity, that a home market should be provided.

It is well known throughout the slave-holding country, that it is the uniform policy of the slave states to stop the importation of slaves from other states, as soon as they are in a situation to dispense with the supply from that source. The most high spirited and dangerous slaves, and those who have committed crimes, are commonly transported to the slave-importing states as a punishment. There is therefore a tendency to bring together in those states, a dangerous mass of materials for insurrection. Accordingly all the states, except Louisiana, have now excluded the trade. They do permit persons moving into their limits for the purpose of residing, to bring their slaves, but none for the purpose of sale. In 1831, Louisiana passed a similar prohibition, but repealed it in 1833, in consequence it was said of the ravages of the cholera. It is well understood throughout the south, that within the present limits of the United States, the slave trade, cut off by law on the north and west of Missouri, must soon cease, except the few sales and exchanges which take place in the vicinage. When this time comes, be it sooner or be it later, whether the Sabine or the Pacific shall form the barrier, the slave empire in this republic must come to an end; for when the planters, and the makers of man-merchandise shall be unable to *sell* it, they must emancipate or massacre. Either way slavery, which is worse than death, would cease. But to this alternative the slaveholders do not intend, without the most desperate efforts, to be driven. The propensity for slaveholding, engendered by education and example, is strengthened by the strongest evils of our nature, as pride, love of

power, love of ease, pleasure and personal consequence, and the corrupting and searing influence of vicious habits. These are all enlisted to perpetuate slavery, and therefore to procure the annexation to the slaveholding southwest of an extensive, rich and lovely land, large enough for five more slave states. The southern press, beginning with a series of essays by *Thomas H. Benton*, has called loudly and unanimously for the annexation, on *some terms* and by *some means*, during the last six years. Many times has it openly avowed the object of increasing the preponderance and security of the slave interest in the union. It is worthy of a passing notice that *Benton's* essays were commenced just about the time that *Jackson's* first instructions were despatched to Poinsett. Samuel Houston an intimate friend, and protege of the President, was noted by a number of presses six years ago, as having gone to Texas for the purpose of revolutionizing it. Could a better hand than he be found for executing the schemes of a Benton, the principal author of the extension of slavery to Missouri, and the prime plotter of the present movement in Texas. Houston now re-appears, in the public papers, collecting troops, sending expresses to the *President of the United States*; and tempting every caitiff in the country by offering to parcel out that beautiful domain of the Mexican nation among those who shall assist in perpetrating robbery and perpetuating the slave-trade and slavery. It has been quaintly said of a distinguished personage, that he offered to give away all the kingdoms of the earth, when the poor *devil* did not *own* a foot of it!

The following is an extract from Benton's Essays on the annexation of Texas, published in the St. Louis Beacon, in the Spring of 1829.

"That these latter [the slave states] have much to fear from the undue preponderance of the free states is proved in every way that human proof can be exhibited to the human mind; in speeches, writings and essays; in newspaper publications; in books and pamphlets; in the acts and proceedings of corporate bodies; in the resolutions and memorials of societies and associations; in the solemn acts of state legislation and in the halls of Congress; from the federal bench, and from the sacred stand of the pulpit; all issuing

for a series of years from the non-slave-holding states, all thickening as time advances, and all tending to one point, the abolition of slavery, under the clause in the declaration of independence, which asserts the natural equality of all men. Dreadful would be the condition of these states—cruel and terrible their fate beyond the power of pen to describe, or pencil to paint, or imagination to conceive, if in the *excessive* preponderance of *free* states, a majority of the judges shall be found on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States to act on the law declared by Mr. Justice Story in his charge to the Grand Jury at Portsmouth, N. H. in May 1820; or a majority in Congress should be found to act on the principles avowed by Mr. R. King in the Senate; or on the principles contained in the petition presented to the House of Representatives by its then Speaker, Mr. J. W. Taylor, in the session of 1822-3; or on the principles contained in the report of a committee of the House of Representatives in the case of the slave of D'Auterive, at the session before the last."

The acquisition of Texas for a slave market was a subject of grave calculation by grey-headed politicians, and men wearing the ermine of *justice* in the Virginia Convention of 1829. Judge Upshur of the Superior Court observed in a very elaborate speech, that if Texas was obtained, as he earnestly hoped, it would raise the price of slaves considerably. Mr. Gholson, of the Virginia Assembly, stated in 1832, that the price of slaves fell *twenty-five per cent* within two hours after the news of the non-importation act of Louisiana was known. The acquisition of Texas* would probably raise their price *fifty per cent* at least. The number of slaves now in the United States, supposing them to have increased as rapidly since 1830 as they did between 1820 and 1830, is 2,444,855, equal at \$200 per head, Mr. Jefferson's estimate, to \$488,971,000. Fifty per cent on this sum is \$244,485,500—the immediate and very certain gain to the slave-holding portion of our fellow citizens from the annexation of Texas. We take into this calculation, which we believe to be under the truth, the political consideration that this annexation will either secure a permanent ascendancy to the slave-holding and nullifying states in the government of the union, or it will enable and embolden them to secede and set up a slave empire in that central, vast and most inviting portion

of the continent. And then if they should want a further market for slaves, some forty or fifty years hence, the Mexicans will have to fight for existence, or fall a prey to this insatiable monster, this modern Minotaur, American slavery. This is inevitable. It was avowed five years ago, in an article in the Edgefield Carolinian, supposed to be from the pen of the present *Gov. McDuffie*, that the juxtaposition of "a free empire to the slaveholding southwest" was a nuisance which ought to be abated by our obtaining Texas. The Georgians could not bear the juxtaposition of Florida. Where is this to end?

To these elements of an important and bloody war in Texas, in fact a war of color, must be added the land speculators in all our principal cities, including some of the most influential officers of government. There is much reason to apprehend that heavy capitalists have dipped into this concern. It is no impeachment of their accustomed sagacity, to suppose them to have calculated with confidence on the success of the grasping and encroaching policy of our slave-holding government in that direction. To the influence of these speculators may be attributed the meetings, committees and donations in our free cities, and the rash levying of war against a friendly republic, in violation of the law of nations, and in defiance of the penal laws of this country, the culpable negligence or collusion of prosecuting officers and grand jurors, and the present imminent danger of a rupture between the two nations. The meetings of the south, on this subject, differ from those of the north, by extending far and wide in the interior, showing that the hearts of the *people* are in this matter. It has been pointed out in the southern papers for the last three years, as the only remaining way of obtaining Texas, that the American emigrants should assume independence, receive aid, and ultimately protection and admission into the union from the people and government of the United States. In Mississippi, three years ago, they made it a test question to their candidates for Congress, whether aid should not be given to the Texians in case they should *secede* from Mexico?

Austin was released from imprisonment, probably by the clemency of the Mexican President, last autumn. He has never given any account of himself. As he had obtained the universal sympathy and commendation of the presses in the

United States without their knowing, why, he probably thought it safest to "let well enough alone." On his return, he was complimented with a public dinner, at which he made a speech, convincing the colonists, we presume, that they could not have slavery, without having war.*

Even now, when war is commenced, no specification of a single act of oppression, of a single infraction of rights, or even the withdrawal of a privilege or indulgence is given. When the United States, with *more than two millions* of inhabitants revolted, it was thought that "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind," required them "to set forth the *causes*, which impelled to a separation." The Texians, being some *fifty thousand in all*, of whom "ten" thousand are undoubtedly opposed to the movement, think it sufficient to cry, "come fight for a fine estate!" This is their manifesto—with this they expect to circumvent the consciences of intelligent freemen, and win them to their standard. How sad a degeneracy in the press and the nation, does the bare venturing of such a proposition argue! But they are right; they are wiser in their generation than the children of light.

They rely upon slave politicians, and upon the Lynchemen of the south, the speculators and their dependents in the north, upon the profligate and desperate every where—upon the secret countenance, and as soon as it shall be safe, the open protection of the government of the United States.

The President, in his late message, announces the singular fact, that he had caused both the contending parties in Texas to be notified, that he should permit no violation of our territory by either. This is very extraordinary. What need of such notification. There may be more in it than meets the ear. It was stated in the city papers a few months ago, that the President had been negotiating a treaty with Indians for *their* lands, *lying within the boundaries of Texas!* If this be true, it may have a connexion without the mysterious giving out in the message. We trust that our President, for *his* credit, is not so shameless as this—to

* Benjamin Lundy, that indefatigable friend of the colored man, informs us in his last number of the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*, that he was near being mobbed *twice* in his late tour in Texas, that the "tar and feathers" were prepared, and would have been applied had not a Mexican officer been near, and informed of the proceeding. But *fanaticism in favor of slavery is quite innocent.*

be pretending that Indian tribes in Mexico, can convey a valid title to the sovereignty and soil, when he has treated the claims of the Indians, even to having an existence, and a grave on their ancestral lands in our country, with so little consideration.

If we are drawn into a war for Texas, slavery and the slave trade, it will become one of the most eventful contests in history. If we are not drawn in, it will be owing wholly to the forbearance or fears of Mexico. But perhaps she has less to fear from such a contest, than is generally supposed. She has a free and compact population of 9,000,000, a veteran army of 20 to 30,000. She would have the sympathy of all the colored classes, both of African and Indian descent. She has colored officers of both races, a circumstance of vast importance in *a war of color* as this would be. She would have the sympathy of the civilized world. Great Britain, as the creditor of Mexico to a large amount, as her principal manufacturer and worker of mines, will, if Mexico desires it, lend any assistance to put an impassable barrier against the further progress of the United States on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico. We have been informed that France concurs with the views of Great Britain in this behalf.

We shall wait with anxiety the further development of this plot, which we regard as one of the greatest and wickedest that was ever contrived "in the tide of time."

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

BRITISH COLONIES.—The West India experiment, continues to verify the positions held by American abolitionists, that immediate and unqualified emancipation is perfectly *safe*, and that the emancipated slaves will readily labor for *wages*. The conduct of the former slaves of the British colonies, whether free or apprenticed, continues to be admirable. Alas, that so much cannot be said of the masters! To a great extent they have abused the apprenticeship to the continuance of the most revolting horrors of the old system. It seems, that through the original inadequate supply of special magistrates to carry into effect the Act of the Imperial Parliament, the Governors of several colonies have been under the necessity of increasing the number, which they have done by commissioning residents more or less connected with the interests of the masters. The consequence has been, that the special magistrates, to a great extent, have given to the appren-

tices, such protection as "vultures give to doves." The evasion of the Abolition Act, had become so gross and general, that on the 19th of June, Mr. F. Buxton moved in the House of Commons—

"That a Select Committee be appointed, to ascertain whether the conditions on which 20 millions were to be granted to the planters of the West India islands and other colonies had been fulfilled."

This motion was accompanied with the most abundant evidence that the conditions had not been fulfilled, that the most horrible cruelties, even to the *flogging of women*, were still perpetrated, while all excuse for such conduct was taken away by the utmost readiness on the part of the apprentices to labor as required by law or more than that for a fair compensation.

The success of the experiment in Antigua is complete. Few planters there are not now well satisfied with the change. The following from Mr. Buxton's speech is amusing as well as instructive.

"In answer to an assertion that it would be difficult to implant a different zest in the minds of the negroes, a person wrote to Mr. Lovings, that he had seen a letter from Antigua, stating that he had collected all his negroes, desiring to know what stores he should send for to England. They all declined ordering any, saying they would wait to see what would be the fashions. (loud laughing), and then they would order for themselves. From other authentic sources the following statement was made to him:

NUMBER OF PERSONS EMPLOYED [ON A PLANTATION.]

1833	1834	1835
Grown persons.....103	Grown persons.....99	Grown persons.....83
Children under 12.... 51	Children under 12....52	Children under 12.....2
<hr/> 154	<hr/> 151	<hr/> 85

"Fewer grown persons were employed in 1835, than either of the preceding years, children so reduced as to 2 from 50. What shall we then say of the manager's complaints; and how shall we sympathize with his despondency; or how shall we reconcile with his accounts of the idleness and unbearable laziness of the negroes, such results as these? In the two months received of this year, much more sugar and rum have been made, more field work has been done, than the average, less field work is left to be done, the provision, of which he knew not how he could prepare any, is all done, and all this by fewer hands than in the corresponding months of the two preceding years; with a reduction of 40 per cent. of the numbers employed, 40 per cent. more work done than on the average of the two preceding years."

To this it may be interesting to add the testimony of Mr. INNES, himself a West India planter, which we find in the London Christian Advocate of October 19th 1835.

"Towards the end of September, the planters became so much alarmed, that an investigation was instituted; and the Secret Council, to whom it was entrusted, after obtaining returns of the working of the system on upwards of eighty estates (half the number in the island), made a most gloomy report. Gradually, however, the attendance increased; and it is now estimated that there are at work—I do not mean continually laboring, but giving a fair share of labor four or five days in the week-- about two-thirds of those who worked as slaves. The remaining third consists of young persons sent to school by their parents, and of men and women settled in town in various employments. There are very few capable of working who do not work at all; and I have not heard of more than half a dozen who have left the island."

More horrors of the apprenticeship have since come to light, and the abolitionists of Great Britain as early as July, were mustering for its overthrow.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

DR. CHANNING ON SLAVERY. *Boston, James Monroe & Co. 12mo. pp. 165.*

THIS little book abundantly rewards the avidity with which it is sought. With an ignorance and misapprehension of the views and measures of immediate abolitionists, which is sufficiently gross, though not unaccountable, Dr. Channing eloquently and unreservedly advocates the very doctrines which have brought down the popular storm upon their devoted heads. Abolitionists will readily perceive that he is much nearer their ground than he supposes himself to be. Most of his censures of their conduct are aimed at things they have never done, and others may well enough be forgotten, in view of the immense benefit he has done to the common cause. It is truly a matter of astonishment that a man who pleads so powerfully for human rights should discard that combined action to which his advocacy necessarily leads. But his absurd notion of substituting "individual action" for that of "affiliated societies" will do little mischief while the public mind continues to be excited to act by such chapters as those on "Property," "Rights," and "The Evils of Slavery." If affiliated societies were not the cause, they would be the effect of just such books as this of Dr. Channing.

MEMOIR OF GRANVILLE SHARP, *By Charles Stuart, Published by the American Anti-Slavery Society, 12 mo. pp. 156.*—We can only say that this memoir of a holy man, and friend of the oppressed, should be in the library of every abolitionist.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.

The 21st of October, 1835, will be memorable for two events of great importance in the history of Abolition. 1. The Anti-Slavery Convention at Utica. 2. The anniversary of the Female Anti-Slavery Society of Boston. The convention at Utica, called by 430 citizens resident in all parts of the state, attracted all eyes throughout the union. By political partizans it was regarded as an occasion of immense importance, the dominant party being thrown into terrors, lest by a seeming connivance they should lose the votes of the South, and their opponents thinking it a good opportunity to annoy them by showing a more thorough and efficient devotion to southern interests. Consequently they were by no means idle. The Convention met in the 2d Presbyterian Church, having been prevented by a mobocratic assemblage, from occupying the Court-room, which had been conceded to them by the Common Council, and proceeded to organize a New-York State Anti-Slavery Society. The promptness of the Convention, which was quite unpremeditated, placed the politicians in a very awkward predicament. They had marshalled their forces and had them under the best possible discipline, but they arrived at the scene of action a little *too late*. The mob, headed by honorable judges and congressmen, drove the abolitionists from the

church, and from Utica, to meet and transact their business in Peterboro' as a society. Thus the politicians after all, fell under the grievous imputation, with their masters, the slaveholders, of having secretly favored those 'fanatics' whom they made such a parade of dispersing. Certainly, nothing can be more true than that every thing they did helped the good cause. It is unfortunate that the publication of the documents ordered by this Convention have been so long delayed. We trust, however, they will soon appear and be greatly useful. Those who attended the Convention, will never lose the impulse there received.

The violence which assailed, on the same day, the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society was overruled no less signally to advance the same glorious cause. The day on which, in the metropolis of New England, 5,000 "gentlemen of property and standing" met to disperse a circle of praying females, and ignominiously to drag through the streets an unarmed unresisting citizen, for advocating the rights of the oppressed, was the day which sealed the triumph of the anti-slavery cause. How many such lessons must the advocates of slavery have, to teach them that they "can do nothing AGAINST the truth, but FOR the truth"? Silence, dead and blockish apathy was their policy, but thanks to God they were too dull to learn it, and it is now *too late*. Amidst all opposition the cause steadily advances. Not less than 200 new societies have been added during the year just closed.

The genius of southern slavery is fairly unmasked. Gov. McDuffie must have the credit of revealing, at last, the true motives and designs of the ruling body of slaveholders. The avowals of his message need no comments. They will bring all true republicans up to the issue. How much better that we should decide it than our children! Hear this matchless rescript of despotism.—

"No human institution, in my opinion, is more manifestly consistent with the will of God than domestic slavery, and no one of his ordinances is written in more legible characters than that which consigns the African race to this condition, as more conducive to their own happiness than any other of which they are susceptible."

* * * * *

"Domestic slavery, therefore, instead of being a political evil, is the corner stone of our republican edifice. No patriot who justly estimates our privileges will tolerate the idea of emancipation, at any period however remote, or on any conditions of pecuniary advantage, however favorable. I would as soon think of opening a negotiation for selling the liberty of the state at once, as of making any stipulations for the ultimate emancipation of our slaves. So deep is my conviction on this subject, that if I were doomed to die immediately after recording these sentiments, I could say in all sincerity and under all the sanctions of Christianity and patriotism. "God forbid that my descendants, in the remotest generations, should live in any other than a community having the institution of domestic slavery, as it existed among the patriarchs of the primitive Church and in all the states of antiquity."

No doctrine of the abolitionists has subjected them to more reproach than their attributing such sentiments as the above to the majority of the slaveholders at the south. We are in a fair way to see the question tested. Already has a warm debate occurred in Congress on a southern proposition to *reject* altogether, petitions praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. The demands of the south are now before us. It remains to be seen whether seven millions of freemen shall become slaves, or two and a half millions of slaves become free.

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

No. III.—For April, 1836.

A MAN, who was inclined to evade the operation of law, built his house across the line which divided two counties. So, when he would shun a process that might be served in his dining-room, he had only to step out of that jurisdiction into his parlor. Some people seem to have located themselves with similar convenience in regard to a line which they have drawn between their *politics* and their *religion*. As religionists they compass sea and land to get all manner of men into the Kingdom of Heaven. As politicians they are in terrors when it is proposed to extend the freedom of their country to some of its people, who differ from themselves in the tinge of the skin. Their theory is, that justice, concession, confidence and good will are to harmonize the heterogeneous extracts from "every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," in the municipal arrangements of the next world, but that those causes are not to be relied on to heal dissensions and keep the peace in this. Wonderful men! Attack slavery as the cancer of our political system, at war with our republicanism, and they become amazingly *religious*. They feel bound by the Bible and conscience to vindicate slaveholding as an ancient right—a sacred and patriarchal institution. Show that the Bible condemns it, as it now exists, in all its parts and principles, and they immediately resort to politics, in its defence. "Slavery is a political institution with which the Bible has nothing to do. It exists by a political necessity. We must take men as we find them. The whites and the blacks can never coalesce on terms of equality. Who ever heard of such a thing?" This to prove that a return to good will, justice and *fair*

pay, on the part of the aggressors, would be a political blunder; to prove that the strongest possible despotism is the safest possible government! The amount of it is, that the slaveholders OUGHT not to be just, because they WILL not be; that the slaves will be the more peaceable, the stronger the provocations to war! This comes of politics without religion, and religion without politics—and we may add, of politics without common sense.

Every one knows that the best way to get along peaceably with his next neighbor, rich or poor, ugly or handsome, black or white, is to respect his rights and cultivate his friendship. Well, what is the country but a multiplication of neighbors? And why not keep its peace by multiplying righteousness and good will?

“But,” say the two-sided reasoners, “Christ and his Apostles meddled not with politics. Their Kingdom was not of this world.” True, but their Kingdom was made up of *men*, and men are the stuff that this world is made of. “Ah! but they did not take men in their political relations!” Then why did they take them at all? What a mockery is Christ’s Kingdom, if it only binds men to love each other *religiously*, while it leaves them to hate each other *politically*!—Is this the Kingdom that was bought by the life-blood of its King, and built up by the ashes of innumerable martyrs?

“But, politically, we northern men have nothing to do with slavery in the States, and as to the trifling amount of it in the Federal District, *policy* forbids us to interfere with that—our doing so might *sunder the Union*.” But this “policy” will be as ruinous as it is irreligious. Let Christian freemen awake to their political responsibilities. The penalty of a little more slumber will come upon them “like an armed man,” and it may be—to wear on their own necks the yokes they would not break from the necks of others, *when they had the power*.

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL. I.

APRIL, 1836.

NO. 3.

REMARKS ON PROFESSOR DEW'S VINDICATION OF
PERPETUAL SLAVERY.

BY WILLIAM JAY, ESQ.

THE massacre at Southampton in 1831 naturally directed public attention in Virginia, to the danger and consequences of servile insurrections. In the succeeding legislature, a portion of the members were led by the recent tragedy, to suggest the expediency of extinguishing slavery in the State at some distant period, and to propose plans for effecting this object. But the love of power and gain, prevailed over the fear of revolt. Not only was every plan for the abolition of slavery rejected, but an act was passed which its authors believed would give additional permanency and security to the institution. A large appropriation was made for the transportation of free negroes to Africa; and lest masters should occasionally avail themselves of this mode of getting rid of their slaves, and thus give an impulse to emancipation, it was expressly provided, that no slave to be thereafter emancipated should have the benefit of the appropriation.

Such a result to the deliberations of a legislature convened immediately after the most appalling servile insurrection recorded in our annals, might, we should think, have satisfied the most devoted partisan of slavery. The debates were published, and they disclosed the alarming fact, that there were native Virginians, men of character and influence, who believed slavery to be a moral and political evil which ought to be removed at some future day. It was important to the permanency of the institution, that

this dangerous heresy should be at once assailed and vanquished, and Mr. Thomas R. Dew, Professor of History, Metaphysics and Political Law, in William and Mary College, immediately buckled on his armor, and sallied forth a champion for the true faith.* And never did a knight-errant exhibit a more gallant bearing; nor did even the hero of La Mancha, rush upon the windmills with more reckless intrepidity, than does our chivalric Professor battle with history and experience, and reason, and the moral sense of mankind. Such courage cannot but excite our admiration, while the courtesy that adorns it, claims our acknowledgments. Accustomed as we are to the rude demeanor of our northern advocates of slavery, as well as to their pusillanimity in admitting its sinfulness, while they justify its continuance, it is really pleasing to meet a champion of interminable bondage, who is at once, a hero and a gentleman.

It is a little unlucky for the Professor, that he descended into the arena so early as 1832, since his first thrust is at the folly of those Virginians who think and talk about the abolition of slavery, whereas "the Parliament of Great Britain with all its philanthropic zeal, guided by the wisdom and eloquence of such statesmen as Chatham, Fox, Burke, Pitt, Canning and *Brougham*, has never yet seriously agitated this question in regard to their West India possessions." p. 5. Now it so happens that only two years after this compliment to the British Parliament at the expense of Virginia legislators, that same body, influenced in part by the efforts of *Brougham*, decreed that within six years slavery should cease throughout the empire; and that personal rights, and civil and religious privileges, should no longer depend upon "the tincture of a skin."

Our author now enters upon the defence of slavery, and satisfactorily proves that it is not a modern institution. Indeed he traces it to very high antiquity, and shews that it has prevailed over a large portion of the globe. In these respects, however, it must yield the palm to murder, since the latter crime dates its commencement in the family of Adam, and has been more or less perpetrated among every people from the time of Cain to the present hour.

* The title of his work is "Review of the Debates in the Virginia Legislature in 1831 and 1832."

The *origin* of slavery is next discussed, and *four* distinct sources are pointed out. We will examine them in their order : —

First. THE LAWS OF WAR. Under this head we are treated with a fervid description of the horrors of savage warfare, and in contemplating the awful picture his own pencil had drawn, Mr. Dew exclaims, “ what is there, let us ask, which is calculated to arrest this horrid practice, (killing and eating prisoners of war,) and to communicate an impulse towards civilization ? Strange as it may sound in modern ears, it is the institution of property, and the existence of slavery.” p. 12. With all his boldness, our champion just at this stage of the combat, seems to draw a quicker breath than usual. He talks of “ the institution of property, *and* the existence of slavery,” when he evidently means the institution of property *in* human beings. It is no reason why a savage warrior should not kill and eat his prisoner, because he possesses a horse ; but a very sufficient one, if that prisoner can be converted like the horse into a beast of burthen for his captor’s service.

Savage warfare then, is one source of slavery—let us see *how* the source sanctifies the stream. “ Judging from the universality of the fact we may assert that domestic slavery seems the *ONLY* means of fixing the wanderer to the soil, moderating his savage temper, mitigating the horrors of war, and abolishing the practice of murdering the captives.” p. 13.

We commend this new plan for effecting civilization, to our missionary boards, and suggest to them the expediency of instructing their missionaries in savage countries, to direct all their efforts in the first instance, to the establishment of domestic slavery, as preparatory to the introduction of the Gospel. Should the missionaries, or their employers have any scruples of conscience about reducing prisoners of war to servitude, let them attend to the following argument :—“ The whole of the ancient world, and all nations of modern times *verging on a state of barbarism* never for a moment doubted this right. All history proves that they have looked upon slavery as a mild punishment in comparison with what they had a right to inflict ; and so far from being conscience stricken when they inflicted the pun-

ishment of death or slavery, they seemed to glory in the severity of the punishment." p. 16.

We are next taught, that the great men of antiquity had none of the modern fastidiousness, on the subject of slavery, and the instances given to prove this point, furnish us, accidentally as it would seem, with the following beautiful illustration of the civilizing, humanizing influence of the practice of enslaving prisoners of war. "Julius Cæsar has been reckoned one of the mildest and most clement military chieftains of antiquity, and yet there is very little doubt that the principal object in the invasion of Britain was to procure slaves for the Roman markets. When he left Britain, it became necessary to collect together *a large fleet* for the purpose of transporting his captives across the channel. He sometimes ordered the captive chiefs to be executed, and he butchered the whole of Cato's Senate, when he became master of Utica. Paulus Emilius acting under the special orders of the Roman Senate, laid all Epirus waste, and brought 150,000 captives in chains to Italy, all of whom were sold in the Roman slave-markets." p. 16.

Thus it would seem that the invasion of Britain, and the devastation of Epirus were caused by the influence of slavery, and that although Cæsar was so distinguished a patron of this humanizing institution, he could nevertheless slaughter not only captive chiefs, but even the whole Utica Senate.

But to proceed—"If we turn from profane history to Holy Writ, that sacred fountain whence are derived those pure precepts and holy laws and regulations by which the christian world has ever been governed, we shall find that the children of Israel under the guidance of Jehovah, massacred or enslaved their prisoners of war." p. 16. When the Creator and Almighty Governor of the Universe shall devote the British nation to destruction for their sins, and shall by a series of stupendous miracles, require and enable the southern planters to execute his wrath, they will no doubt be excusable in killing or enslaving as many Englishmen as possible; but it is not clear to us, that in an ordinary war, the rights of victors over their prisoners, are thus extensive. The Professor indeed, does not explicitly contend for this right as belonging to *civilized* belligerents, but seems chiefly to rely on the *rights* of *savage* warriors, to

make out his first source of slavery. Now it will be recollected, that it is part of the very essence of slavery, that it is perpetuated by descent. Let us suppose that one of the ancestors of our Virginia Professor had been captured by the royal but savage father of Pocahontas, and had, after the peace effected by that generous damsel, been sold as a slave to one of the Colonists. The whole transaction, according to the teacher of "Political Law" in William and Mary College, would have been strictly legal, sanctioned not only by innumerable instances in savage warfare, but by the example of Julius Cæsar, Paulus Emilius, and other great men of antiquity, and above all, by the conduct of "the children of Israel under the guidance of Jehovah." The posterity of the hapless captive, would of course through successive generations have been lawfully held in bondage, and the Professor, instead of publishing theories about slavery, would at the present day, by his own shewing, be fairly, justly and honestly experiencing in his own person the blessings of hopeless interminable servitude, with the assurance that his own fate would be the inheritance of his children after him.

The second source of slavery is "STATE OF PROPERTY AND FEEBLENESS OF GOVERNMENT." It seems that during the existence of the feudal system in Europe, property was concentrated in the hands of a few, and that government did not, and could not protect the rights of the many. "The *people* of those days could find no employment except on the land, and consequently were entirely dependent on the landlords, subject to their caprices and whims, paid according to their pleasure, and entirely under their control; in fine they were slaves complete." p. 21. Should some strong man armed, seize our author, and reduce him to servitude, we imagine he would be disposed to question the lawfulness of the second source of slavery.

The third source we are told is, "BARGAIN AND SALE." How far a man can lawfully sell himself and his children after him, is a question of little interest in reference to American slavery, since among the millions of slaves in our country, not an individual has probably ever been a party to such a contract.

The fourth and last source of slavery, mentioned in the work before us, is "CRIME," and under this head, is in-

cluded "INSOLVENCY." It would, we suspect, be in vain for our southern planters to search the records of our criminal and insolvent courts for the judgments authorizing them to hold in servitude that vast multitude of human beings whom they call their property.

We have now considered all the modes, by which, as we are informed, the original equality of mankind may be destroyed, and a portion of the human family be converted into chattels for the use of their more fortunate brethren. We beg the reader to select the one, which in his opinion justifies the present bondage of two millions and a half of his countrymen. These slaves, with but few exceptions, were *born* in servitude; consequently they were not prisoners of war—nor were they enslaved in consequence of the inability of the government to protect its citizens—nor did they sell themselves—nor lastly, were they made slaves on account of crime, or insolvency. But admitting these several causes of slavery to confer on the original master, his heirs and assigns, a valid title to the slave, and to his posterity, must not the present proprietor be able to trace his title in order to justify possession? Be it remembered, that these four sources have no reference to *complexion*, and of course justify the slavery of white men, just as much as they do that of black men; and be it also remembered, that American slavery embraces slaves of as fair complexion as that of the masters.* Now we would ask, is it not reasonable that

* This assertion will probably startle many of our readers; it is however strictly true. These white slaves are indeed *called* negroes and mulattoes, not on account of their *complexion*, but merely because they *are* slaves. In 1834, the right to one of these slaves (10 years of age) was contested before the court of Lincoln County, Missouri. The following is extracted from the report of the trial:—"He (the slave) was examined by the jury and by two learned physicians, all of whom concurred in the opinion that very little if any trace of negro blood could be discovered by any external appearances. All the physiological marks of distinction which characterize the African descent, had disappeared. His skin was fair, his hair soft, straight, fine and white, his eyes blue, but rather disposed to the hazle-nut color; nose prominent, the lips small and completely covering the teeth; his head round and well formed, forehead high and prominent, the ears large, the tibia of the leg straight, the feet hollow. Notwithstanding these evidences of his claims, he was proven to be a *descendant* of a mulatto woman, and it was proved that his progenitors on his mother's side had been and still were slaves; consequently he was found to be a SLAVE."

The last summer a slaveholder from Maryland, caused a young woman, (Mary Gilmore) to be arrested in Philadelphia, as his fugitive slave. A legal investigation ensued when it was established by the most abundant unquestionable testimony, that the alledged slave had been brought up in Philadelphia, and was the child of poor IRISH parents.

every man should be presumed to be the master of his own limbs, and of his own conscience ; and ought not he who claims his fellow man as *his property*, to prove his title to him ; we do not mean by exhibiting as some one quaintly expresses it, “a bill of sale from his maker,” but by tracing the servitude of his slave, or of the slave’s ancestor, to one of the four legitimate sources of slavery?

Now there is not an American slaveholder, who according to the principles laid down by our author can shew a good title to a single slave ! Of what avail then, is this labored inquiry into the *four* sources of slavery ? The sources when discovered, in no degree reconcile the institution with the precepts of christianity, and if they did, it is impossible to shew that any slave now in the country, owes his servitude to either of them.* The truth is, the Professor has left this part of his task incomplete. He did not find it convenient to examine *all* the sources of slavery. We will take the liberty to continue his catalogue, and proceed to the

Fifth source of slavery—ROBBERY BY VIOLENCE. The African slave trade has been from the first, a system of robbery, and is now acknowledged by our national legislature, to be PIRACY. Yet this trade is the original source of ninety-nine hundredths of American slavery. The Professor himself admits, in reference to this trade, that “countries have been overrun, and cities pillaged, mainly with a view of procuring slaves for the slave-dealer.” p. 40. This fact is most abundantly established by the testimony taken by order of the British Parliament, pending the discussion of the abolition of the traffic. It cannot be questioned, that the great mass of slaves transported to this country, were violently robbed of their liberty by their stronger neighbors in Africa, for the express purpose of supplying the trade. It is equally certain, that the traders knew *how* the supply was generally obtained, and that the American purchasers were well aware, that they were dealing in the spoils of robbery. It is a maxim of our law, that possession originating in fraud or injustice, no matter how long it may have continued, can never give a title. And will it be maintained, that although it may be unlawful to hold a

* We except from this remark, those blacks who have been made slaves for pretended crimes, under the iniquitous laws in relation to free negroes.

stolen man as property, yet if we do hold him till he has children, our title to the children and to their posterity is indefeasible ?

But there are many who have *in our own country* been violently robbed of their liberty. Could the number of free negroes who have been kidnapped and sold into slavery, be ascertained, the community would be appalled by the disclosure. Soon after the revolution, societies were formed in New-York and Philadelphia, having among their objects the protection of this class of our citizens. The instances are not few, in which whole families have been forcibly abducted, and carried to the south. Indeed the practice of kidnapping is a matter of such public notoriety, that it would be a waste of time to attempt to prove its existence. When we recollect that a robust man with a black skin, will sell in the market for eight hundred or a thousand dollars—that slavery is declared by many northern divines, not to be forbidden in the Bible,—that it is extolled as a blessing by southern statesmen ; and that free negroes are denounced by multitudes of all classes as “nuisances,” and great efforts made to send them to another continent ; it is not wonderful that men should be found, quite willing to convert nuisances into blessings, by transmuting free negroes into slaves, especially when they can fill their pockets by the process.

Sixth source of slavery—**ROBBERY BY VIRTUE OF LAW.** In every slave state, we believe without one exception, there are laws for the manufacture of slaves. Thus, if a black citizen of New-York enters the state of Georgia, as by the Federal Constitution, he has a right to do, the law imposes on him a heavy fine, which it knows beforehand, he will probably be unable to pay, and in default of payment, he is robbed of his liberty, being sold as a slave for life, under pretence of raising money to pay the fine. So in other states, free negroes, for acts which involve no moral guilt, but which in some instances “lean to virtue’s side,” are doomed to slavery, and their children after them. Thus, for example, a free colored woman and *three* children were sold in South Carolina in 1827, as a punishment for concealing two fugitive slave children. Here were four persons robbed of their liberty by a single judgment. But such robbery is righteousness itself, compared with that which is perpetrated BY THE AUTHORITY, AND WITHIN

THE EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. In the CITY OF WASHINGTON, in the capital of the greatest and proudest Republic in the world, a municipal officer, may without oath, without complaint, without the allegation of crime, seize a free citizen, and deliver him to the UNITED STATES' Marshall, who may consign him to a dungeon in the UNITED STATES' prison. After the door of the dungeon has been made fast, this officer of the FEDERAL UNION is required by law to announce in some newspaper that a prisoner of such a name and appearance, is confined on SUSPICION of being a fugitive slave, and that his MASTER is desired to come and take him out. But being a free citizen, he has no master, and of course no master can take him out. And what then? Why then, by the authority of the CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, he is sold at auction to the highest bidder, as a slave for life, to raise money to pay his "JAIL FEES," that is, to raise money to pay THE UNITED STATES' MARSHALL for his trouble in keeping this *free* and *innocent* citizen in prison. This same Congress which thus robs a guiltless citizen of his liberty, and reduces him and his posterity to bondage, consigns to the hangman the robber who seizes and sells an African savage!!

Having completed our inquiry into the "sources," we now proceed with Mr. Dew, to consider the "advantages" of slavery. After expatiating on the goodness of the Deity, he exclaims "Well might we have concluded from the fact, that slavery was the *necessary* result of the laws of mind and matter, that it marked some benevolent design, and was *intended* by our Creator for some useful purpose.—We have no hesitation in affirming, that slavery has been perhaps the *principal* means for impelling forward the civilization of mankind—without its agency, society must have remained sunk in that deplorable state of barbarism and wretchedness, which characterized the inhabitants of the western world, when first discovered by Columbus." p. 28.

Did we err in saying, that the Professor is a bold champion? Not contented with this general statement of the blessings of slavery, he goes on to enumerate them. The first on the list, after the mitigation of the horrors of savage warfare, already mentioned, is "its tendency to check the frequency of war, and to destroy that migratory spirit in

nations and tribes, so destructive to the peace and tranquility of the world." p. 29. It was this institution then, that probably rendered the Roman Republic so remarkably pacific, and which produces that mild, quiet and forbearing demeanor which characterizes our fellow citizens of the south.

The next advantage is, the increased amount of labor performed by savages when reduced to servitude. "It may be truly affirmed, that the *taming* of man, and rendering him fit for labor, is more important than the taming and using the inferior animals, and nothing seems so well calculated to effect this as slavery." p. 29.

Now it seems to us, at least questionable, whether slavery is in truth the means *best* calculated to tame a savage, and also that the importance of taming him, depends very much on the *purpose* for which he is to be tamed. If that purpose be, to strip him of all the attributes of humanity, and to convert him into a mere beast of burthen, we deny both the benevolence and the policy of taming him.

"Strange as it may seem, we have little hesitation in declaring it as our opinion, that a much greater number of Indians within the United States would have been saved, had we *rigidly persevered in enslaving them*, than by our present policy." p. 32. Unquestionably the Georgians would not have insisted on driving the Cherokees beyond the Mississippi, had each Indian been worth to them from five hundred to a thousand dollars; but whether it would have been better for the Indians themselves to have been reduced to slavery, or to have been treated with justice and kindness, is a question which our author omits to solve.

But in the catalogue of blessings conferred by slavery, the most extraordinary, and we venture to say, the one least anticipated by our readers, is its influence "ON THE CONDITION OF THE FEMALE SEX"! That we may not do injustice to the Professor, we will permit him to speak for himself. "Slavery changes the hunting into the shepherd and agricultural states—gives rise to augmented productions, and consequently furnishes more abundant supplies for man: the labor of the slave thus becomes a substitute for that of the woman: man no longer wanders through the forest in quest of gain; and woman, consequently, is relieved from following on his track, under the enervating and harrassing burthen of her children: she is now surrounded by her do-

mestics, and the abundance of their labor, lightens the toil and hardships of the whole family; she ceases to be a mere beast of burthen." p. 36.

It seems to have escaped Mr. Dew's recollection while penning this argument, that there were such beings in the world as *female* slaves. Where slavery prevails, we are told that woman ceases to be "a mere beast of burthen," and yet it so happens that in the slave states, there are more than ONE MILLION OF WOMEN, who in consequence of slavery, are mere beasts of burthen, exposed and sold like cattle in the public market, deprived of the rights and endearments belonging to the relations of daughter, wife and mother, unprotected from violence, and kept in ignorance and degradation.

Such is the influence of slavery on the "female sex." But our author refers to its influence on the *LADY*, and not on the "*domestics*," by whom she is "surrounded." She, we are assured, "becomes the charming and animating centre of the family circle—time is afforded for reflection, and the cultivation of all those mild and fascinating virtues which throw a charm and delight around our homes and firesides, and calm and tranquilize the harsher tempers and more restless propensities of the male." p. 36. Far be it from us to question the charms and virtues of the southern ladies, to whatever cause Mr. Dew may ascribe them; but surely no one acquainted with northern society, will dare to assert, that it is necessary to brutalize one portion of the sex, in order to elevate the other to the highest degree of purity and loveliness, of which the female character is susceptible.

Having been instructed in the origin of slavery, and the advantages attending it, we are next furnished with an historical account of its introduction into our country. This account closes the first part of the Professor's work, and the object to be attained by the facts and reasonings contained in this part is stated as follows:—"We hope that this preliminary discussion, will not be considered inappropriate to our main subject—we have considered it indispensably necessary, to point out the true sources of slavery, and the principles on which it rests, in order that we might appreciate fully the value of those arguments based upon the principles that 'all men are born equal'—that 'slavery in

the abstract is wrong,' that 'the slave has a natural right to regain his liberty,' &c. &c. ; all of which doctrines were most pompously and ostentatiously put forth by some of the abolitionists in the Virginia Legislature." p. 46.

The question is then presented to the reader, whether slavery in the United States is to be temporary or perpetual ; and to assist him in deciding it, the second part of the work before us, is devoted to the consideration of "plans for the abolition of negro slavery."

The first plan examined is "emancipation and deportation," or in other words, "African Colonization." This plan is demonstrated, at least in our opinion, to be utterly incompetent to the abolition of slavery. Mr. Dew dwells largely on the ruin which would overspread the southern region from an expulsion of its laboring population, and exposes with much ability the absurdities involved in the scheme. The following extract from his argument, merits the attention of the Colonization Society : "Virginia is in fact a negro raising state for other states ; she produces enough for her own supply, and SIX THOUSAND (annually) for sale. Now, suppose the government of Virginia enters the slave market, resolved to purchase six thousand for emancipation and deportation, is it not evident that it must overbid the southern seeker, and thus take the very slaves who would have gone to the south ? The very first operation then of this scheme, provided slaves be treated as property, is to arrest the current which has been hitherto flowing to the south, and to accumulate the evil in the state.—The action of the Virginia government, in an attempt to emancipate and send off 6,000 slaves, will be, to stop those who are annually going out of the state ; and when 6,000 are sent off in any one year, (which we never expect to see,) it will be found on investigation, that they are those who would have been sent out of the state by the operation of OUR SLAVE TRADE, and to the utter astonishment and confusion of our abolitionists, the black population will be found advancing with its usual rapidity ; the only operation of the scheme being, to substitute our government, *alias ourselves*, as purchasers, instead of the planters of the south."p. 49.

Emancipation by deportation, being found impracticable, the next inquiry is of course directed to "emancipation without deportation." Now, this inquiry we are told "is

between the relative amount of labor which may be obtained from slaves *before* and *after* emancipation." p. 88. Hence it seems, the question of the perpetuation of slavery, is one of dollars and cents, and not of human rights and moral obligations. It must be admitted that very many whites, as well as blacks, would perform more labor under the stimulus of the lash, than of their own free will. If, therefore, a man's right to liberty depends on the excess of his voluntary labor over that which could be extorted from him, there are multitudes of freemen, who ought to be slaves. Our author himself belongs to a class denominated by political economists "the unproductive." He has probably never in his life, raised half a bushel of corn, whereas by proper discipline, he might have been made to add a thousand to the common stock. Now, should it be proposed to reduce *him* to servitude, "the question would be, between the relative amount of labor which may be obtained from a Professor, *before* and *after* he is enslaved." We fear the decision would be unfavorable to the interests of the college which now enjoys the honor and benefit of his mental endowments.

Having explained the principle which is to determine the continuance or abolition of slavery, he proceeds to apply it, by asserting that the free blacks taken as a whole, "must be considered the most worthless and indolent of the citizens of the United States—the very drones and pests of society;" and we are assured, that this character does *not* arise "from the disabilities and disfranchisements by which the law attempts to guard against them." p. 88. After dwelling much on their idleness and profligacy, he proposes the important question, "Why are our colored freemen so generally indolent and worthless, among the industrious and enterprising citizens of even our northern and New England states?" p. 92. Now to this question *we* would reply, because they are deprived by unjust laws, and cruel prejudices, of almost every incentive to vigorous and honorable exertion, and are *kept* in ignorance, depravity and idleness. We conscientiously believe that had Mr. Dew been reared and treated from infancy, just as most of the southern free blacks are usually reared and treated, great as his natural endowments unquestionably are, he would himself have been a drone and a pest. But let us attend to the answer he gives to the question. "It is because there is an *inherent*

and *intrinsic* cause at work which will produce its effect under *all circumstances*. In the free blacks, the *principle of idleness and dissipation* triumphs over that of accumulation, and the desire to better our condition : the animal part of man gains the victory over the moral." p. 92. Such is the solution of this moral phenomenon, given by our Professor of Metaphysics ; and what does it amount to ? Why, that God has implanted in the constitution of the black man, "a principle of idleness and dissipation," which is "inherent and intrinsic," and which of course does not belong to the white man. Unfortunately for this inherent and intrinsic principle ; the Professor cites the example of the liberated serfs of Poland, Livonia, and Hungary, to prove that emancipated slaves will not work. These serfs who were in fact *white* slaves, he describes as being in the lowest state of degradation and wretchedness. "Were it not," he says, "that the experiment would be too dangerous and costly, we would have no objection to see our slaves gratified with the enjoyment of freedom for a short time. There is no doubt, but that they, like the Poles, Livonians, &c. would soon sigh again for a master's control, and a master's protection." p. 91. We wonder what intrinsic "principle" distinct from their "disabilities and disfranchisements" prevented the elevation of these white Poles, Livonians, &c. Suppose a child of one of these serfs, brought to a New England village, and there sent on week-days to the common school, and on Sundays to the meeting-house ; at all times treated with Christian kindness, and at a proper age, taught some reputable trade, is there any principle, that would necessarily cause him when a man, to sigh for a master's control, and a master's protection ? Possibly similar management might counteract "the principle of idleness and dissipation" in the children of our free blacks. We should like to see the experiment made.

But to return to our author—"The great evil however of these schemes of emancipation remains yet to be told. They are admirably calculated to excite plots, murders and insurrections ; whether *gradual* or *rapid* in their operation, this is the invariable tendency. In the former, you disturb the quiet and contentment of the slave who is left unemancipated, and he becomes the midnight murderer to gain that fatal freedom whose blessings he does not comprehend. In

the latter case, want and invidious distinction will prompt to revenge." p. 101. So it seems, gradual is no less dangerous than immediate emancipation, of course Mr. Dew will pray that slavery may continue forever, and to this prayer the whole south with almost one voice, will respond a loud amen.

Having shewn that slavery ought to be perpetual, the Professor *next* proceeds to discuss its morality. One would have thought that this discussion would have been the first in order of time, but the place assigned to it, perfectly accords with the standard of duty assumed in it. "It is said, slavery is wrong in the abstract, at least contrary to the spirit of christianity. To this we answer, that any question must be determined by its circumstances, and if as is really the case, we cannot get rid of slavery without producing a greater injury to both masters and slaves, there is no rule of conscience, or revealed law of God which can condemn us." p. 106. In other words, the commands of God are binding upon us only so far as we think it expedient to obey them; and hence expediency, as determined by frail, ignorant and selfish creatures, is the test of moral obligation! Let us try the application of this test. A poor wretch is imprisoned for crime, and his jailor compels him to work, and pockets the avails of his labor. At length the term for which he was sentenced, expires, and he becomes legally entitled to his liberty. Now it is certain, that if he goes out of his cell, not only will the jailor's profits go with him, but a tale will be told of extorted labor, and embezzled proceeds that may prove very injurious to his keeper. Moreover, he is now well fed, clothed and lodged; but if released from his present wholesome restraint, his vicious propensities will probably subject him to penury and suffering. Now, if in the opinion of the jailor, greater injury will result both to himself, and to the prisoner, from the discharge of the latter, than from his detention; then according to Mr. Dew, there is no rule of conscience or revealed law of God, that can condemn the jailor for retaining his prisoner, and enjoying the fruits of his labor! Would that the Virginian Professor had a patent right for this standard of morality, and was *exclusively* entitled to use it. But alas, it is daily employed at the north by every reverend apologist for slavery, to prove that however wrong the institution may

be in the abstract, its continuance is lawful up to the very moment in which it becomes *expedient* to abolish it. Surely these gentlemen will on reflection admit, that if the Creator of Heaven and Earth be indeed infinite in wisdom and benevolence, he both knows and wills the good of his creatures; and hence that *his laws* are and must be the standard, and the only standard of expediency; as they are of moral obligation. These laws teach us, that it may under certain circumstances be expedient to cut off a right hand, to pluck out a right eye, to lay down our life itself; and they assure us, that to barter the soul even for the whole world, would be a profitless exchange.

Mr. Dew proceeds at great length to vindicate the *moral influence* of slavery on the character and condition of both master and slave. We will not contest the matter with him. His own book, were other testimony wanting, would settle the question with us. Such heartlessness, such balancings of dollars and cents against the social and intellectual enjoyments and everlasting happiness of millions of his countrymen; such complacency in the contemplation of perpetual bondage, ignorance and degradation; such strange estimates of duty, cannot, we are persuaded, be the natural outpourings of his heart, but are the baneful fruits of the institution in which he has been nurtured.

We have indeed treated this gentleman's arguments and opinions with freedom; but for himself, we entertain no small degree of respect. He has displayed in the work before us, talents of a high order, great industry of research, undoubted sincerity in his opinions, and a decency of manner towards his opponents, which his northern coadjutors would do well to imitate. He defends slavery with an ardor proportionate to the love he bears it, but his weapons are facts and arguments, not insulting epithets, and base imputations. We hear from him, no sickly professions of hostility to slavery in the abstract, and then labored arguments to prove, that the Bible sanctions what *he* is pleased to condemn—no admissions of the sinfulness of slavery, coupled with assertions of the lawfulness of its indefinite continuance. Instead of cowardly shrinking from an enquiry into the character of his favorite institution, and branding as traitors to the constitution and the union, all who presume to examine; he descends into the arena fully

armed for the contest, and proudly throwing down his gauntlet, challenges discussion. If it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for Capernaum, exalted as she was unto Heaven by the great and peculiar privileges she enjoyed, surely our Virginia Professor, nurtured in the bosom of slavery, will at the final account, rise up in judgment with its northern apologists, and condemn them.

OBJECTIONS TO ABOLITIONISM TESTED BY THE
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE.

BY WILLIAM GCODELL.

'SLAVERY' was 'tested by its own code,' in an article which appeared in the first number of this Magazine.—But *Slavery* is not the only thing which should be brought to the *same* test. A host of OBJECTIONS against Anti-Slavery principles and measures are daily urged, in utter forgetfulness of the *facts* composing the system against which abolitionists contend. They are heard from thousands who would blush to defend slavery, but who find an apology for their own inactivity, in the supposed errors of those who are engaged in Anti-Slavery efforts. It should be remembered by such persons that the *validity* of their objections must depend upon the *facts* of the case. Abolitionists are said to be censorious and harsh, injudicious and unwise, indiscreet and unjust, while their accusers never seem to consider that the wisdom and justice of these charges must depend much upon the *facts* which comprise the American slave system.

But the objector is "as much opposed to slavery as any one."—Perhaps he is so. We may possibly test this matter as we proceed. It is not, however, the point under present review. The question is not *who are* most opposed to slavery, but—how much and in what manner *ought* slavery to be opposed? In order to decide this question correctly, we must remember what *American* slavery *is*—not what some *other* form of servitude *has* been.

'Slavery is a great evil.'—The objector readily admits this. But he does not approve the *measures* that are taken

to remove it. The fair presumption then is, that, however *great* he may conceive the evil to be, he does not conceive it to be precisely the *same thing* that abolitionists conceive it to be. And conceiving the disease to be different, he naturally conceives of a different remedy. A consumption is 'a great evil.' And so is a dropsy. So likewise is a drought, a famine, a conflagration, a bad memory, and a discreditable representation in Congress. But no one would ever think of curing all these 'evils' by one and the same process! If we would agree in our measures, we must first agree in respect to the *facts* upon which we wish our measures to operate.—Who stops to think of this? Among all who have criticised anti-slavery principles and measures, what writer has undertaken to prove from *the facts* of slavery, as it now exists in our land, that the remedy proposed is not the true one, or that the mode of operation is unsuitable?

What then is American slavery? This was the question discussed in our previous article. The system was 'tested by its own code;' and the following items were found to comprise the definition.

"1. *The assumed right of man to hold property in man—to transform moral beings into mere THINGS—chattels personal—human brutes.*"

"2. *The denial of God's moral government over the slave—the usurpation of His authority—the annihilation of the rights of conscience.*"

"3. *A direct infringement of religious liberty, by specific acts of legislation for the express purpose.*"

4. *The prohibition of obedience to Gods' law—the prohibition and discouragement of moral purity and chastity—the legalization of concubinage—compulsory excitements to vice.*

5. *Theft—robbery—plunder—piracy—man-stealing.*

6. *The absence of "protection for the lives and persons of the slaves."*

This is SLAVERY.—The necessary existence in the slave system, of the THINGS signified by the terms above mentioned, according to the common use of language, by the definitions of our lexicons, our bibles, and our American statute books, was proved from *facts* furnished by those statute books themselves.

In calling slavery piracy, robbery, and theft, we only call-

ed it by the names which our *own* laws, in *other* cases, call the actions which they permit and legalize in respect to the *slave*. In its laws against the foreign slave trade, the national code goes farther, and declares that these actions even when committed against Africans, and against slaves, on the African coast, are piracy, man-stealing and robbery.—We will insult no man's understanding by a formal attempt to prove that the same act, committed on the American coast, is essentially and morally the same thing ; whether allowed or prohibited by human laws.

If these statements express *facts*, and if no one dares question the proofs by which they are sustained, then those who undertake to criticise the course of abolitionists, are morally bound to recognise them as *facts* : and they cannot *themselves* maintain a fair claim to that character for candor, wisdom and justice which they deem so essential in others, if they refuse to bear these facts in mind, and give them their full weight, in all their reasonings in respect to the right mode and means of operating against slavery.—With these preliminaries let us proceed to canvass some of the current objections against anti-slavery views and measures.

1. "*Vituperation—abusive epithets—slander.*" Abolitionists are accused of these. Many, it is said, agree with them in their general principles, and would gladly join them in their efforts, if it were not for the vituperation, abuse and slander with which they assail the slaveholders.—This is the *charge*. What are the *facts* of the case ?—Abolitionists affirm slaveholding to be man-stealing—thief—robbery.—*Therefore* they are deemed abusive, slanderous, vituperative. But do they merit the imputation ?—Not if slavery be, *in fact*, the thing they affirm it to be. To treat of slavery, and not represent it to be what it *is*, would be to fall short of the truth, and make it less odious than God sees it to be—less odious than men ought to view it.—We must therefore enquire again—"What are the *facts* ?—Is slavery theft, or is it not ?—Is it robbery, or is it not ? Is it man-stealing, or is it not ?—Words are nothing apart from the things they signify ; otherwise no one would be annoyed by them.—If it be a *fact* that slaveholding is man-stealing, theft, and robbery, then abolitionists cannot vary their practice of calling it by these names without direct disobedience to the commands of God.

2. *But would it not be better to approach the slaveholders in a different manner?* Would it not be better to cease reproving them, and propose to them some practical remedy?—Not if slaveholding be the thing which its own code proves it to be.—Slaveholding is *sin*. Repentance is the only remedy—conviction the indispensable preliminary—the truth the only adequate means of producing it.—If slavery were a mere calamity it would require a different treatment. If it were a mere error in political economy, it might be remedied by a mere lecture on that science.—But this is not the *fact*, and therefore it is folly to act as if it were otherwise.

3. *But the slaves should first be prepared.*—Prepared for what? For emancipation.—And what is emancipation?—Relief from slavery.—And what is slavery? Its own code informs us.—How does the objection look in view of *the facts* of the system?

The law deems the slave mere “goods and chattels?” The objection says this law must not be repealed till the slave (continuing in this condition) is prepared to be deemed in law a human being? How is such a preparation to be effected?—By education? What! The education of “goods and chattels?” How educated? By laws which forbid the slave to be considered a human being? By laws which forbid education?

The slave law inflicts a penalty on every one who teaches a slave. The objection says this law must not be repealed until the slave is first educated!

The slave law takes the slave out from under the moral government of God, to the full extent of its power, and places him under the control of an irresponsible mortal.—The objection says that this law must not be repealed, until the slave has received all the moral culture afforded by being placed under the moral government of God!

The law secures no religious privileges to the slave, and prohibits the master himself from teaching him to read the Bible. The objection says that this law must not be repealed until the slave possesses all the qualifications of those who have read the Bible and enjoyed the best religious advantages!

The slave code withholds the hire of the laborer. The objection says that a man must not be paid for the labor he

has performed until he has gotten the education which the wages are necessary to pay for.

The slave code breaks up the family condition and forbids the enjoyment of it. The objection says the law must not be repealed until the slave possesses the intellectual and moral qualities of those who enjoy the family condition!—It says the husband must first be prepared, before he can be allowed to protect his wife and enjoy her society! The wife must first be prepared, before she can be allowed the protection of her husband! The mother must first be prepared, before the law is repealed which permits a [“Chistian”] barbarian from tearing her infant from her bosom! The babe must first be prepared before it can be allowed the care and protection of its parents!

The slave laws do not protect the life and limbs of the slave from brutal and lawless outrage. The objection says this protection must not be given, until the slaves, without this protection, are prepared to be protected!

4. “*But immediate emancipation would be dangerous.*” What is it that would be dangerous? Does the objector remember what emancipation is? He cannot, unless he remembers the precise *facts* of the slave system itself.

Emancipation is deeming and holding the laborer to be a *man*, and not mere “goods and chattels personal.” Would there be any thing dangerous in this?

Emancipation is placing the laborer under the government of God, and of law, instead of the capricious control of the individual master. Would there be any thing dangerous in this?

Emancipation is giving the laborer fair wages for his services. Would there be any thing dangerous in this?

Emancipation is allowing the laborer to live in the family condition. It is admitting the right of the husband to live with the wife—the wife with the husband—the child with the parent—the parent with the child. Can there be any thing dangerous in this?

Emancipation restores the intellectual and religious rights and liberties of the laborer—admits his right to education—to the advantages of Christian instruction and worship—to the perusal of the Sacred Scriptures. Can there be any thing dangerous in this?

Emancipation extends protection to the life and limbs of the slave. Can there be any thing dangerous in this?

Emancipation confers all these benefits. Will they excite a spirit of revenge? Must it not be dangerous to *defer* such emancipation? And can there be any thing more *safe* than its instant and universal extension to every slave?

5. "*But the slaves would be no better off!*" How does this objection appear in view of *the facts* of slavery? Let not the reader's patience tire with the constant recurrence of them to his view. It needs more patience to listen to the ever recurring objections which live only in a total forgetfulness of the slave code.

What is it that the objection affirms? It affirms that human beings are no better off, when considered and treated as such, than when held as brute beasts! It affirms that men are no better off under the moral government of God, than under the absolute control of sinful men! It affirms that laborers are no better off when they have a voice in determining their own wages, than when they labor for no wages at all, but on the same terms as oxen and horses. It declares that the husband, the wife, and the children, are no better off when they dwell securely together, enjoying the Heaven appointed ownership of each other, than when the fiat of a mercenary usurper may sunder them to the four winds. Let him who can have the effrontery to say, he believes this, place himself in the condition of the slave. We will not disturb him there.

6. "*But the slaves would all starve if they were emancipated!*"—Would they indeed? It is a pity they should be starved! But why should emancipation starve them? What is emancipation? And what is slavery?

Slavery provides the slave with a peck of corn a week—that is—provided the master obeys the laws enacted to prevent short feeding!—*Obeys* them, when no slave can enter a complaint, and no colored person testify!—Admirable protection from starvation!

Emancipation starve the slave! How? Will it break his bones and unstring his nerves? Will it cause the fields to labor, the moment a compensation is offered him?

Will the laborer starve because he is now deemed a *man*, and no longer a thing? Will he starve because just laws govern him, and not the dictates of a despot? Will he starve because he is paid wages? Will he starve because restored to the family condition, and cheered by the smiles and assistance of his wife and children? Will he starve because

his property and earnings are protected? Will he starve because he is allowed to read the Bible, and taught the duties of a responsible moral agent? If not, he will not starve in consequence of emancipation. For the *facts* of the *slave code* assure us that *these* are the changes which emancipation will bring to his condition.

7. "*But give us your plan!—Abolitionists propose no plan!*"—A plan for what? Here are certain wicked and unjust laws. Do you want a plan for repealing them?—Here is a slave under the slave code. Do you want a plan for placing him in the condition of other men?

"Undo the heavy burthens—let the oppressed go free—break every yoke."—This is God's plan.—It is the plan of abolitionists. Is it not sufficient? Con over again the slave code, and see whether the nature of the case admits of any other plan. Do you want a plan for accounting a man to *be* a man, and not "chattels personal"? A plan for permitting a human being to have no other God before his Creator? A plan for setting a man free from the unlimited control of his neighbor? A plan for paying wages to him who earns them? A plan for allowing husbands and wives, and parents and children to live together? A plan for permitting human beings to be educated? A plan to stop punishing "~~with death without benefit of clergy,~~" the persons who teach the poor of the land to read the Bible? A plan to extend the protection of the laws to all the subjects of government?—Shame!

But a plan perhaps is wanted, for the evasion or procrastination of these duties—some "apprenticeship system"—some scheme for future instead of present repentance and justice—some cunning device for removing the victims instead of the principles and practices of oppression. Abolitionists have no such plans. "A wicked and adulterous generation" may seek after such plans, but God will never approve them.

Is it a plan of operations to produce immediate emancipation, that is enquired after?—It is comprised in a word—"Cry aloud—spare not: show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sin." A glance at the slave code will show that this plan is the only appropriate one. By adopting it, abolitionists encounter, of course, a host of worldly and time serving objections.

8. "*But would you set the slaves loose all at once?*"—Loose *from* what? From the restraints of just laws? No. Loose *into* what? Into the restraints and protection of equal laws?—Yes. Certainly, and without delay. "Loose the bonds of wickedness."

But will it do to turn them loose?—Who are they?—*What* are they?—Wild beasts?—No.—Human beings?—Yes.—Place them then in the conditions of human beings—No human being, not even the sagacious objector himself should be turned loose from the control of law.

"Turning the slaves loose"!—Just glance, with one eye, at the slave code, and trace with the other, the ludicrous folly of fearing that emancipation will turn the slave loose.

The emancipated slave is let loose from the condition of "goods and chattels." He is loosed from the irresponsible control of his master, and suffered to "roam" under the government of human and divine laws. The husband and wife are turned "loose" out of mere concubinage into the inviolable sanctity of the marriage state! The child is let "loose" from the shambles—into the arms of its mother! What a horrible turning of human beings loose!—The immortal soul is to be let loose from the shackles of ignorance and heathenism. And, strange to tell, the limbs and persons of human beings are actually to be set loose from those who may kill them "with moderate correction," according to law.

This is all the "letting loose" which is contained in emancipation. Avarice, domination and lust have too long been "let loose" in our land. It is high time *they* were restrained.

9. "*But we should be overrun with them.*" Yes. We of the north should be overrun with emancipated slaves, and therefore, we must not plead for their emancipation!—Most benevolent and conscientious plea! Look at the picture presented by the slave code, and see whether you will be willing to meet this plea hereafter.—See two millions and a half of your countrymen trodden in the dust—"deemed, sold, taken and reputed to be mere goods and chattels"—"entirely subject to the will of their masters"—plundered of their earnings and of themselves—forbidden to make the will of God their rule of action—denied the lights of education and religion—unprotected by law—unblessed with the sanctities of domestic life—insecure in the tenderest re-

lations—*then* say—"We should be overrun with them if they were emancipated!"

But why should the emancipated laborers of the south flock to the north? Would it be because there is more land here to cultivate? Would the southern planters industriously do all their own work, and the northern farmers, all at once, fold their hands, and conclude to have their lands tilled by colored laborers?—Would the northern climate suit the colored people better than that of the south? Are their early attachments here? Are their friends and relatives here?—The reverse of all this is *the fact*, and nothing induces the colored people now to reside at the north but their insecurity at the south. Abolish slavery and they would prefer residing with the southern people, whose prejudices against color are slight compared with ours.—Nothing but the heartlessness of this objection can equal its stupidity.

10. "*But the masters must be compensated!*"—Compensated for what? Have they done any thing deserving a reward?—Are they requested to do any thing which merits a reward, or requires the bestowment of a bounty upon them? Charity impels the belief that no man ever talked of a compensation to slaveholders, while remembering *what slavery is*, and while clearly discerning the things wherein emancipation consists. How does the proposition look, when placed by the side of *the facts* revealed in the American slave code.

Here is a man who has stolen the person of his equal brother, or, what is the same thing, has knowingly purchased or inherited him of those who originally stole him. He has held his fellow man as mere goods and chattels, under a code which does not deem him or treat him as a human being.—What compensation shall be awarded him for this? Or what compensation shall he claim for ceasing from the shameful practice? Again, the slavemaster for a long series of years, with his fathers before him, has lived upon the unrequited labor of the slave; and now, instead of offering compensation to the slave, he modestly asks one for himself! Compensation for having robbed and plundered his neighbor!

Not only so.—Here is the immortal mind in ruins! How much of the compensation is claimed on this account? Here is the act of withholding the light of the

Bible! How much compensation does this merit? Here is another item in the inventory.—Husbands torn from their wives—wives from their husbands, parents from their children and children from their parents!—How much compensation is to be awarded on this score? Slavery has left its victims unprotected in their lives and limbs. Multitudes have been sacrificed. Stripes without number have been inflicted; and the slave statutes, in their preambles, bear testimony to *the fact* that even cutting out the tongues and boring out the eyes, and cutting off the limbs, are practices chargeable to some slaveholders! How much compensation do the oppressors claim for such deeds? What human being, without a blush, can desire or ask of a civilized community, compensation as the condition upon which the power of doing such things shall be relinquished?

11. "*But emancipation would ruin the masters?*" And suppose it should? Con over again the horrid inventory of the slave code, and tell me if the pecuniary loss of the oppressors is to be named as a reason why justice should not be extended to the oppressed!

But look over the slave code again; and see whether it is to be credited that its repeal would impoverish the state, or starve the planter, or dry up the sources of individual or national wealth.—Emancipation breaks no bones of the laborer—unstrings no muscles—what does it do? It supplies the stimulus of wages instead of the cart whip.—By paying the laborer for his toil, it saves the expense of a driver to punish his delinquency.

Would it ruin the master to have the laborer considered a *man* instead of a brute beast? Would it ruin the master to have his servant live under the moral government of God and be instructed in his will? Would it ruin the master to have his laborers intelligent, virtuous and contented? Would it ruin the master to pay his laborers their honest earnings? Would it ruin the master to have his laborers live in the family state, and be secured in that relation? Would it ruin the master if he should be deprived of the privilege of selling the wives and children of his laborers, as he would sell his lambs and fatlings, his horses and pigs? Would it ruin the master if he should be prohibited by law from whipping his laborers to death by "moderate correction," or from whipping them at all?

12. "*But we have no right to interfere.*"—Abolitionists do not propose to interfere by physical force, nor by appeals to the slaves, nor by usurped legislation over the slave states. It is only by moral means—it is only by bearing testimony against sin—it is only by exhibitions of truth and duty, that abolitionists interfere with slavery.

Now look at the facts comprized in the slave code, and let us learn who they are that *in view of them*, will have the effrontery to say that we have no right to open our mouths against such enormities.

Here are two and a half millions of human beings trodden in the dust, denied the attributes of humanity, "deemed in law to be mere goods and chattels." I am myself a human being, and I am told that I have no right to complain of this outrage on my species!

Here are laborers plundered daily of their earnings. I am a laborer and am told that I have no right to say that the practice is a dishonest one.

Here are husbands robbed of their wives, and fathers plundered of their children.—I am a husband and a parent, and I am told that it is an unpardonable impertinence for me to lisp a syllable against such infamous proceedings!

Here are subjects of the government unprotected by the laws. I am an American citizen and have no right to ask protection for my neighbors and fellow countrymen!

The man who can fix his eye on the American slave code, and tell me I have no business with its facts, and have no right to remonstrate against slavery, is the man who would deny me all my rights if he dared. He would unhesitatingly become a slaveholder himself and make me his slave.

13. "*But the constitution sanctions slavery, and guarantees the rights of slaveholders.*"—What rights? Where is the guarantee?

If it be said that the Constitution of the United States leaves the slavery of the slave states where it found it, under the control of the state legislatures; that it binds all the people of the United States to suppress servile insurrections; that under its provisions the fugitive slave is returned to his master, and that the "free whites" of the slave states enjoy an unequal representation in Congress, there is no question to be made of the correctness of the statement.

But this does not come to the point under review.—It is pretended that the Constitution of the United States affords a guarantee to the claims of the slaveholder, and forbids any person to call in question the equity of his claims. I call for the proof of these assertions. I spread out the Constitution of the United States. I place it by the side of the American slave code, and ask for the pretended guarantee, and the pretended denial of my right to expose its enormities.

In what part of the Constitution is it written that the citizen of the United States may not reprove man-stealing; that he may not be a swift witness against them that oppress the hireling in his wages; that he may not pronounce the abrogation of the 5th and 7th commandments to be a sin against God; that he may not rebuke the forcible separation of husbands and wives, of parents and children; that he may not declare that “all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.” That he may not “preach the gospel to every creature;” that he may not bear testimony against laws which forbid men to read the Bible, and leave human life unprotected?

Let our constitutional lawyers point out, if they can, the clauses of our national Constitution which contain these provisions. Let them prove, if they can, that the Constitution of the United States, actually guarantees to its citizens the *right* of committing the innumerable *wrongs* included in the slave codes of the Southern States!

14. “*But it will divide the Union!*”—Divide the Union to do what?—To cease the practices comprised in the system of slaveholding? To say that those practices are anti-republican and unchristian? Will it divide the Union to do either of these?

To condemn robbery and man-stealing, it is said, will divide the Union! To oppose by argument and entreaty the separation of husbands and wives will divide the Union! To claim for the infant the protection of its mother will divide the Union! To say that man cannot lawfully sever whom God hath joined together, will divide the Union. To say that all men have a right to search the Scriptures will divide the Union. To say that “the laborer is worthy of his hire” will divide the Union! To say that the people of

the United States have a right to their own souls and bodies will divide the Union. To say that Americans ought to be protected by the laws, will divide the Union.

What would a union be—and what would it be worth, that could be divided in this manner?

15. "*But there is such a terrible excitement!*"—And is this a reason for holding our peace?—Look again at the facts embodied in the slave code, and give us your answer. What creates the excitement? Who are excited? And wherefore?

Are persons excited too *much*, who bear testimony against slavery? Let the objector "remember them that are in bonds as bound with them." Let him imagine himself, for one brief hour, in the condition described by the American slave code, and we shall see whether he thinks there is too much excitement against slavery!—Go through with the astonishing metamorphosis. In the first place, you are degraded to a mere thing. You are no longer accounted a human being! But hush! There will be an excitement if you complain to any human being. You are next forbidden to obey God and conscience, and the Bible. You are to yield yourself to the absolute control of a single man!—But don't be excited!—You are to labor all your life long, without compensation. But beware of excitement!—Your wife and child are no longer yours! Never heed it. There will be an excitement! Your Bible is taken from you. Let no Christian brother remonstrate. There will be an excitement!—The laws are removed which protect you from outrage and violence. Say nothing. Let no man say any thing. It will create an excitement.

But the excitement is *not* among those who bear testimony against these crimes.—No.—Strange to tell. We can look upon the horrible facts with tolerable composure. The excitement is on the other side. The excitement is *against* human rights, and liberty, and religion, and humanity. The excitement is among the friends of the oppressor—not among the friends of the oppressed!

The advocacy of freedom begets an excitement among tyrants, and therefore, the first principles of civil and religious liberty must be suppressed! Is such an excitement a reason for holding our peace? If we think so, we shall certainly become slaves, and almost merit our destiny.

There is an excitement in the land? Why? Because *the slave code has been brought out into day-light*. What is the remedy? "Hide it again" says the objection. Cover up the horrors of slavery! The public vision cannot bear them! But they cannot be covered up. They never will be! The right arm of Jehovah hath laid them bare. They stand revealed before the universe. Nothing can allay the excitement but the repeal of the slave code. Blot it out. Annihilate it. Then, and not until then, will there be any end to the excitement.

16. "*But emancipation should be gradual and not immediate.*" Ah! Should it? Look again at the slave code and see! Ought the things wherein slavery, according to its own code, *consists*, to be gradually abandoned? Is gradual emancipation safe? Is it prudent? Is it practicable, compared with immediate emancipation, in view of the slave code?

Slavery, according to the testimony of its own code, is the concentrated essence of the most hateful and atrocious crimes. Should practices like these be gradually abandoned? Man-stealing—robbery—the use of service without wages—the violent severing of husbands and wives—the kidnapping of innocent children—the withholding the light of the Bible—the forbidding of education—the reign of laws which leave human life unprotected—the compelling of human beings to herd together like cattle, regardless of the sanctities, and unprotected in the relations created by the marriage contract: the declaration, that "slaves can make no contract," and "are not entitled to the conditions of matrimony:" these are the things which constitute American slavery. Are such practices to be gradually abandoned? Are sins like these to be forsaken slowly, one at a time, or partly forsaken, and partly practised?

And wherein would consist the wisdom, or prudence, of abolishing these practices gradually, if it could be done? Is this process more safe than immediate and universal emancipation? The people of the south do not think so. Manumissions were becoming so numerous at one time, that laws were enacted to prevent them. What was the plea? It was this. It was accounted unsafe to *hold slaves* in a community where a *part* of the slaves had been set free. The slave code therefore bears testimony that gradual emancipation is less safe than immediate, or universal.

100 Miles Long: 110 Miles Broad



60 Miles

HAYTI or ST DOMINGO

"THE HORRORS OF ST. DOMINGO."

BY THE EDITOR.

THE caption of this article has passed into a sort of charm against all humane interference with what some of our fellow citizens are pleased to call "their peculiar species of property." We shall make it our business to analyze these magic words, and to discover, if possible, from what incantations they derived their spell-binding power.

There are few so sceptical as to doubt the existence of the two following facts, viz: first, that St. Domingo once teemed with an immense population of degraded slaves, sixteen times more numerous than their masters, and secondly, that the same island, under the name of Hayti, now contains a much larger population of freemen, under an organized and independent government, and who, according to their own account of the matter, have no desire to return to slavery. How the intervening "horrors" could have been conjured into an anti-liberty beacon, to scare men so proud of their own "blood-bought liberty" as our countrymen, is a mystery worthy of solution. Does the secret lie in that portentous monosyllable, *black*? This deepens the mystery. The more probable hypothesis is, that truth may have met with foul play, somewhere between the two facts above mentioned.

What have been the probabilities of our getting at the whole truth in regard to St. Domingo, for the last forty seven years? Singularly small and disadvantageous to the cause of Haytian liberty. 1. The triumphing of slaves could expect little sympathy from slaveholders, or their abettors. We as a nation, by color and practice, were on the side of the defeated. Our planters sympathized with the planters of St. Domingo; and by interest as well as sympathy were impelled to forestall public opinion by the most favorable representation of their case. 2. Many whites, driven from St. Domingo, told us their own story with none to call it in question, and this too over the wine cups of open-hearted hospitality, in a land where the parties of the other part, had they been present, would have had to sit at the *second table*. 3. The language of the Haytians being foreign to us, the *English* stepped in as our interpreters. *They* wrote

the histories which alone stand on the shelves of our libraries; and wrote them with even stronger motives to justify the whites and condemn the blacks, than our own slaveholders could have had.

Bryan Edwards, the historian of the West Indies, accompanied an armament which sailed from Jamaica to Cape François in September, 1791, for the purpose of putting down a revolt of the negroes who were said to have risen to the number of 100,000. He gathered his information from the terrified planters, and put forth his "*Historical survey, &c. comprehending a narrative of the calamities which have desolated the country ever since the year 1789, with some reflections on their causes and probable consequences, &c.*" in 1797, while a British army was yet in St. Domingo striving to reinstate the planters in their ancient "property." His elegance as a writer, is not more conspicuous than his enmity towards such friends of freedom as Sharp, Clarkson and Wilberforce, whom he does not scruple to characterize as "fanatics," and mad "exciters of rebellion."* Another line will make the portrait of this historian sufficiently complete for the American reader. He thus calumniates the good Lafayette. "This man had formerly been possessed of a plantation at Cayenne, with seventy negro slaves thereon, which he had sold without any scruple or stipulation concerning the situation of the negroes, the latter end of 1789, and from that time enrolled himself among the friends of the blacks."† To this blind or wilful mangler of truth, more perhaps than to any other source, does our country owe its impressions of the "horrors of St. Domingo." With a callous heart and graphic pen he dwells on the atrocities of the revolted slaves till humanity is in ague-chills. Yet it is by his philosophy, and not his facts, that he attempts to make out a case against the slave, and the friends of the slave. Nay, on the ground of the very facts which came most immediately under his observation, the

* History of St. Domingo, p. 85.

† History of St. Domingo, p. 62.—It is well known that Lafayette purchased a plantation at Cayenne for the express purpose of proving by experiment the practicability of colonial cultivation by free labor. The negroes whom he purchased and employed, were never sold by him, but unhappily they were sold contrary to his will, when his estates were confiscated by the French National Assembly. This took place however in 1792, not 1789.—See *Recollections of the private life of Lafayette*, by M. Cloquet, vol. 1, p. 150.

conclusions which he labors to establish may be easily overthrown. The same thing is true of Consul General McKenzie, James Franklin and the rest of the humble copyists, imitators and successors of Bryan Edwards.

The horrors of St. Domingo may be thus classified : 1. The horrors of insurrection. 2. The horrors of emancipation. 3. The horrors of the Code Rurale. 4. The horrors of idleness. 5. The horrors of desolation.

I. THE HORRORS OF INSURRECTION.

We have no disposition to deny or palliate the bloody and unnatural atrocities perpetrated by either party in the protracted wars of St. Domingo. Human nature ought to recoil from them with horror and disgust. But when these horrors are imputed to a wrong cause ; when they are hung up as a warning over the calm sea of humanity and fellow feeling, and not over the rocks and shoals and whirlpools of despotism, it is time to lift up a note of remonstrance.

The main object of Edwards' book is, to show that the insurrection in St. Domingo was caused by a set of men who held and promulgated the doctrine that "all men are born and continue free and equal as to their RIGHTS." He holds up the insurrection as the fruit of that doctrine ; and he puts forth his history as a complete refutation of it.

If it be true that the advocates of equal rights instigated the oppressed to vindicate their claims by violence and blood, it was their error and their sin. We do not seek to justify such conduct. But the truth of the charge against the *Amis des noirs*, or friends of the blacks, is far from being proved by Bryan Edwards, while another cause is proved, which is of itself abundantly sufficient to account for the facts. We mean the oppressive and hypocritical conduct of the whites. There were in the French part of St. Domingo in 1789 not less than 480,000 slaves. They were treated, according to Edwards, neither much better nor much worse than those of Great Britain. This treatment he supposes to have been mild and just. But what sort of mildness and justice it was, may be gathered from the following admissions in regard to slavery in general. After stating that the slaves of St. Domingo could not avail themselves of what he calls the "tenderness and philanthropy of the *Code*

Noir," he adds, "In countries where slavery is established, the leading principle on which government is established is FEAR; or a sense of that absolute coercive necessity, which having no choice of action, supersedes all question of RIGHT. It is in vain to deny that such actually *is*, and necessarily must be, the case in all countries where slavery is allowed. Every endeavor therefore to extend positive rights to men in this state, as between one class of people and the other, is an attempt to reconcile inherent contradictions, and to blend principles together which admit of no combination." The treatment that was received from these masters who thus ruled by *fear*, would of course depend much upon their character. They were avaricious, Says Edwards, in his preface, "Let me not be understood, however, as affirming that nothing is to be attributed on this occasion to the slave trade. I scorn to have recourse to concealment or falsehood. Unquestionably the vast annual importations of enslaved Africans into St. Domingo, for many years previous to 1791, had created a black population in the French part of that island, which was, beyond all measure, disproportionate to the white;—the relative numbers of the two classes being as sixteen to one."* p. xxii. They were licentious. To a population of 30,000 whites, there were 24,000 *mulattoes*. The following picture shows a baseness of tyranny which has no parallel, except perhaps in our own country. Edwards says of the *mulattoes*, "In many respects, their situation was even more degrading and wretched than that of the enslaved negroes in any part of the West Indies; all of whom have masters that are interested in their preservation, and many of whom find in those masters powerful friends and vigilant protectors. Although released from the dominion of individuals, yet the free men of color in all the French islands were still considered as the *property of the public*, and as public property they

* "In 96 years, ending in 1774, 800,000 slaves had been imported into the French part of St. Domingo, of which there remained only 250,000 in 1774. Of this last number only 140,000 were Creoles, or natives of the island, i. e. of 650,000 slaves the whole posterity were 140,000. *Considerations sur la Colonie de St. Domingue*, published by authority in 1777." Quoted from Clarkson's "*Slavery and commerce of the Human Species*" p. 156.—At this rate, with what infernal rapacity must the slave trade have been driven, nearly to double the slaves in the next 19 years! Edwards himself states the number imported in 1788 to have been 29,506, in 98 vessels, i. e. 301 to each vessel! Of these slaves 15,674 were men, 7,040 women, 4,245 boys, and 2,547 girls! p. 208.

were obnoxious to the caprice and tyranny of *all* those whom the accident of birth had placed above them. By the colonial governments they were treated as slaves in the strictest sense ; compelled, on attaining the age of manhood, to serve three years in a military establishment called the *maréchaussée*, and on the expiration of that term they were subject, great part of the year, to the burden of the *corvées*;—a species of labor allotted for the repair of the high-ways, of which the hardships were insupportable. They were compelled, moreover, to serve in the militia of the province or quarter to which they belonged, without pay or allowance of any kind, and in the horse or foot at the pleasure of the commanding officer ; and obliged also to supply themselves at their own expense, with arms, ammunition, and accoutrements. Their days of muster were frequent, and the rigor with which the king's lieutenants, majors, and aides major, enforced their authority on those occasions over these people, had degenerated into the basest tyranny. .

"They were forbidden to hold any public office, trust, or employment, however insignificant ; they were not even allowed to exercise any of those professions, to which some sort of liberal education is supposed to be necessary. All the naval and military departments, all degrees in law, physic, and divinity, were appropriated exclusively by the whites. A mulatto could not be a priest, nor a lawyer, nor a physician, nor a surgeon, nor an apothecary, nor a schoolmaster. Neither did the distinction of color terminate, as in the British West Indies, with the third generation. There was no law nor custom that allowed the privileges of a white person to any descendant of an African, however remote the origin. The taint in the blood was incurable, and spread to the latest posterity. Hence no white man who had the smallest pretensions to character, would ever think of marriage with a negro or mulatto woman ; such a step would immediately have terminated *in his disgrace and ruin*.*

"Under the pressure of these accumulated grievances, hope itself, too frequently the only solace of the wretched, was denied to these unfortunate people ; for the courts of

* This is not strictly true. The industry and wealth of the mulattoes in the neighborhood of Les Caves, made them so much superior to the whites, that the latter were fain to shoulder the "disgrace," for the sake of the gold of mulatto wives. See *A. Metral, Histoire de l'Expédition*, &c. p. 192.]

criminal jurisdiction adopting the popular prejudices against them, gave effect and permanency to the system. A man of color being prosecutor, (a circumstance in truth which seldom occurred,) must have made out a strong case indeed, if at any time he obtained the conviction of a white person. On the other hand the whites never failed to procure prompt and speedy justice against the mulattoes. To mark more strongly the distinction between the two classes, the law declared that if a free man of color presumed to strike a white person of whatever condition, *his right hand should be cut off*;* while a white man for a similar assault on a free mulatto, was dismissed on the payment of an insignificant fine."—p. 7.

Such were the masters to whom the slaves were still more entirely subject. Deep as was the degradation of the free mulattoes, the slaves were still lower.† Were this not true, why did not the mulattoes, instead of holding slaves, become slaves, as they easily might?

A man must be very blind not to see here sufficient cause for the "horrors of insurrection." Whatever may have been the spark that caught it, the planters themselves had filled the magazine and laid the train which blew them up. But we are enabled to demonstrate from the narrative of Bryan Edwards himself that the planters, with their own hands, and not the Amis des Noirs, applied the match.

The facts antecedent to the first and great insurrection of the slaves in 1791, *as related by this author*, were these. No sooner had the news of the calling of the States General,

* In Maryland, for this offence, a justice of the peace may direct the offender's ears to be cropped. *Stroud*, p. 97.

† Edwards thinks the mulattoes had "solid ground of complaint and dissatisfaction," and that "their actual situation and condition would have made resistance duty, if it did not appear that the redress of their grievances occupied the very first deliberations of the first general assembly of representatives that ever met in St. Domingo. * * * Concerning the enslaved negroes, however, it does not appear that the conduct of the whites towards them was in general reprehensible. I believe on the whole it was as lenient and indulgent as was consistent with their own safety. It was the mulatto people themselves who were the *hard-hearted task-masters to the negroes*. The same indignities which they received from the whites, they directed without scruple towards the blacks; exercising over the latter every species of that oppression which they loudly and justly complained of, when exercised on themselves."—pp. 81, 82.

QUERIES.—Would not the insurrection of the mulattoes, then, have been a righteous act *before* the calling of the assembly? And, a fortiori, would not the rebellion of the slaves *under the mulattoes* have been "a duty" at any time?—If so, then Edwards himself must justify the rebellion of about *one fourth* of the slaves.

afterwards termed the national assembly, the great revolutionary council of France, in 1788, reached St. Domingo, than the white colonists, who had long groaned under despotic French governors, determined to avail themselves of the occasion to vindicate their own rights. They accordingly, in spite of the proclamations of their governor, elected and sent eighteen deputies to represent their interests in the popular legislature of the mother country. These deputies of the colonists were received by the national assembly with some jealousy, and only six of them obtained seats. The mulattoes, many of whom resided at Paris, and some of whom were wealthy and intelligent, availed themselves of the popular enthusiasm in favor of liberty, to prejudice the people and the Assembly against the white colonists, and in favor of themselves. The treatment of their deputies, the conduct of the mulattoes, and, above all, the declaration of the national assembly, August 20, 1789, that "all men are born, and continue, free and equal as to their rights," highly exasperated the white colonists. They at once organized three legislatures of their own, one at Cape François, one at Port au Prince and one at Les Cayes. These assemblies agreed in nothing but the resolution to call a general assembly of the colony, provided instructions should not be received from the king for the calling of such an assembly, within three months. While the whites took these measures for the security of their own interests and power, no concessions were made to the mulattoes. The latter, however, were resolved to assert their rights by force, and to that end assembled in various places under arms. For want of concert, they were easily overpowered. Two magistrates, Messrs. Dubois and Ferrand de Beaudierre, who in a moderate and peaceful way had espoused the cause of the mulattoes and also expressed themselves opposed to slavery, were arrested. The former was rescued by the governor and sent to France, but the latter was taken from prison by the mob and cruelly put to death. An order for convoking a colonial assembly was received in January, 1790. The colonists complied with it, changing the time and place of meeting, and the mode of election. The national assembly having heard of the tumultuous proceedings of the colonists, and fearing they would revolt or declare their independence, decreed on the 8th March, 1790, "that it never was the in-

tention of the Assembly to comprehend the interior government of the colonies in the constitution which they had formed for the mother country, or to subject them to laws which were incompatible with their local establishments; they therefore authorize the inhabitants of each colony to signify to the national assembly their sentiments and wishes concerning that plan of interior legislation and commercial arrangement which would most conduce to their prosperity." It was also declared, "That the national assembly would not cause any innovation to be made directly or indirectly, in any system of commerce in which the colonists were already concerned." The mulattoes clamored against this as cutting off their hopes of relief from civil disabilities, and the *Amis des Noirs*, because it sustained the slave trade. The result of the excitement thus occasioned, was another decree of the national assembly, on the 28th of March, giving more particular instructions for the execution of that of the 8th, and especially, "that *every* person of the age of twenty-five and upwards, possessing property, or having resided two years in the colony, and paid taxes, should be permitted to vote in the formation of the colonial assembly." The first general colonial assembly met at St. Marc on the 16th of April. It consisted of 213 members, fully representing the *whites* of the colony. This assembly at once set itself to the work of reforming the abuses which had grown up under the arbitrary sway of the royal governors. For the sake of conciliating the mulattoes, they were released from an unequal share of the military service. Mitigations of the slave code were also talked of. And on the 23th of May, 1790, a sort of republican constitution was put forth,—as fully republican as could well be based on the foundation of slavery. But the governor, Peynier, assisted by Col. Mauduit, had the address to gain the mulattoes to the royalist party, by promising a more full restoration of their rights. Having thus at least neutralized the strongest elements of republicanism, he raised a prodigious clamor against the assembly, charging it with having sold the colony to the British. The provincial assembly of Cape François, and all those who were directly interested in the old order of things, joined his standard. The assembly was dissolved by proclamation, and the two parties prepared to decide the controversy by arms. This civil war, how-

ever, was checked by the sudden embarkation of the general assembly on board the Leopard ship of war, of which they had got possession by the mutiny of its crew. They sailed to France in the hope of obtaining from the mother country by their personal influence, a ratification of their constitution. In this they were disappointed. The news of their proceedings, which reached France before them, made both the royalists and revolutionists their enemies. The former hated them for asking liberty for themselves, the latter for refusing it to others. At this juncture it was, while both parties in the mother country joined in condemning the colonists, that *James Ogé* sailed from France with the design of vindicating the cause of the people of color by force of arms. He was the son of a mulatto woman of St. Domingo, who educated him in Paris and sustained him there, "in some degree of affluence, after he had reached the age of manhood," by the profits of her coffee plantation. "Ogé had been introduced to the meetings of the Amis des Noirs, under the patronage of Gregoire, Brissot, Lafayette, and Robespierre, the leading members of that society; and was by them initiated into the popular doctrine of *equality*, and *the rights of man*. Here it was that he first learnt the miseries of his condition, the cruel wrongs and contumelies to which he and all his mulatto brethren were exposed in the West Indies, &c." (p. 41.) "The society procured for him the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the army of one of the German electors," and patronized his expedition. To avoid the danger of exporting arms from France, he was furnished with the means of procuring them on his way, in New-England. Though his arrival at St. Domingo was anticipated, he effected his landing there secretly from an American sloop, on the 12th of October, 1790. He is said to have conveyed his arms and ammunition undiscovered to a place which his brother had provided for their reception. Ogé and his brothers commenced immediately to excite the *mulattoes* to revolt. Promises and money were plentifully used. They were told that the whole nation of France and the king himself favored their cause. But after six weeks of indefatigable effort, only 200 followers were obtained, and they were "raw and ignorant youths, unused to discipline and averse to all manner of subordination and order."

It must be remarked that the mulattoes in the colony had remained quiet during the session of the colonial assembly at St. Marc. Those who had been enticed by Mauduit to join his standard against the assembly, 300 in number, soon becoming sensible of their error, requested a dismissal and returned to their homes.

Ogé established his little camp at *La Grand Riviere*, about 15 miles from Cape François. From this place "he despatched a letter to the governor [*Peynier*] wherein after reproaching the governor and his predecessors with the non-execution of the *Code Noir*, he demands in very imperious terms, that the provisions of that celebrated statute should be enforced throughout the colony; he requires that the privileges enjoyed by one class of inhabitants (the whites) should be extended to all persons without distinction; declares himself the protector of the mulattoes, and announces his intention of taking up arms in their behalf, unless their wrongs should be redressed." p. 43. Edwards does not tell us what reply the governor made, but says that the *inhabitants* of Cape François proceeded with the utmost vigor to suppress the revolt. Ogé was defeated, fled to the Spanish territory, was given up on the demand of Blanchelande the successor of Peynier, and with his lieutenant Chavannes was condemned to be **BROKEN ON THE WHEEL** on the 9th of March, 1791. Twenty of his followers, one of whom was his brother, were condemned to be hanged at the same time. Chavannes met his terrible fate with firmness, but Ogé implored mercy and promised to make important disclosures, if his life should be spared. A respite of twenty-four hours was granted him. In this time he confessed to the functionaries a very extensive conspiracy in which the slaves had been excited to take part, and which would have broken out in the February preceding, but for the extraordinary *inundation of the rivers*. He also disclosed the still more important facts that the chiefs of the mulattoes still retained their project, and held their meetings in certain subterranean passages to which he would conduct the functionaries if his life might be spared. The functionaries would do no such thing. They were contented with the information they had got already, and after bringing poor Ogé back to the horrid engine to which he had been devoted,

they kept the whole matter a *secret* till it was extorted from them by the colonial assembly *nine months afterwards*. Begging the reader to remember these things, we pass on.

Though the people of color had been apprized by their friends in Paris, that the decree of March 28th, 1790 was intended to give them the right of suffrage, yet that interpretation of it was so stoutly denied by the whites that they sent deputies to France to obtain from the national assembly a special explanation. While this subject was before the assembly in May, 1791, the news of the barbarous execution of Ogé arrived. The sympathy excited by it, aided the Amis des Noirs to obtain a decree that the *people of color* born of free parents, were entitled to *all the privileges* of French citizens. This was the famous decree of the 15th of May, 1791. 'This it was according to our author, which "gave life and activity to the poison," that was already fatally at work upon the fidelity of the slaves of St. Domingo. And how did it work? We shall see. The news of the decree having been received at Cape François on the 30th of June, "no words can describe the rage and indignation which immediately spread throughout the colony." The white colonists at the Cape threatened to seize the ships and confiscate the goods of the French merchants. They actually laid an embargo, and moved in their provincial assembly to pull down the national flag and hoist the British. The national cockade was every where trodden under foot. The governor promised "*to suspend the obnoxious decree, whenever it should come out to him properly authenticated.*" The natural effect of this rage was the assembling of the mulattoes in armed bodies. "The whites by a mournful fatality," says our author, "suffered them to assemble without molestation." They busied themselves with the election of a new colonial assembly which met at Leogane on the 9th of August, and took the name of the *general assembly of the French part of St. Domingo*. Having done very "little business," with "great unanimity and temper in their proceedings," they adjourned to meet at Cape François on the 25th of the same month.

Such were the facts, *according to Bryan Edwards*, that preceded the first and most dreadful insurrection and massacre of St. Domingo. What are the facts, *according to the same author*, in regard to the insurrection itself. It broke

out on the 23d of August, just before day, on a plantation in the parish of Acul, nine miles from the Cape, spread rapidly through the neighboring parishes, and indeed throughout the whole North. It was confined to the *slaves*. The free *mulattoes* of the Cape assisted efficiently in putting it down. The atrocities perpetrated were of a savage and relentless character. In a short time no less than 2000 whites are supposed to have been massacred, and 10,000 blacks were slain by sword or famine. The rebellion soon extended to the West, into the neighborhood of Port au Prince, where for the first time we hear of armed bodies of *mulattoes*, 2,000 of whom appeared at Mirebalais, and with 600 negroes, ravaged and burned the country. The white planters finding them every where victorious, and not averse to a reconciliation, negotiated with them a truce or convention called the *Concordat*. The condition insisted on by the *mulattoes* and yielded by the planters, was that the latter should faithfully execute, not only the *Code Noir*, but the decree of the 15th of May. One of the reasons stated by Edwards, why the *mulattoes* were so ready to negotiate, was, that they found themselves *unable to excite the slaves to revolt*. In the *Concordat* the rights of the *slave* were forgotten. The general assembly had by this time learned wisdom enough to proclaim that they would no longer oppose the decree in favor of the rights of the colored people.

Now, let us philosophize a little upon these *facts*. 1. The white colonists must thank themselves for the whole of this insurrection. It arose altogether from oppression, and the special excitement was their own revolutionary struggle, together with their cruel treatment of the *mulattoes*. The principal *mulattoes* were themselves planters, and slave owners. It is Edwards, too, that asserts that they were more cruel and oppressive masters than the whites. Hence a prejudice between the two classes scarcely less than that between the whites and colored. The philosophy of Edwards is not sufficient to conceal this. The *mulattoes* had no sympathy for the enslaved blacks, not even cordiality enough to use them for their purposes. *They assisted to subdue them.*

2. The precious story about Ogé is stamped with absurdity on its face. Whatever may be said of "Gregoire, Brissot, Lafayette, and Robespierre," it must be admitted that

they possessed at least common wisdom in adapting their means to their ends. Had they been base enough to desire an insurrection in St. Domingo, it is utterly impossible that they should have selected *such* a man as Ogé, or have sent him by *such* a route, or with *such* means. The Amis des Noirs sought the freedom of the slaves, but their agent, Ogé, said not a word to excite them to assert it, or if he did, he utterly failed. The circumstances of the *colonel's rank*, procured from a petty German elector, is too ridiculous for refutation. The French republicans of 1790, buying up German *titles* to grace a *secret* stirrer up of insurrection! How characteristic! Again, the *confession* of Ogé! We must beg pardon of the reader for the imputation which may arise from our stopping a moment to expose its trumpery. It is barely possible that some such confession may have been made by one of the Ogés for the sake of saving his life. But the probability is, that the whole was fabricated by some cunning member of the colonial assembly "*nine months*" after the execution of Ogé and three months after the insurrection, for the sake of injuring the mulattoes. It is hardly to be supposed that Ogé, however agitated, would have perpetrated the silly blunder of making the negroes of St. Domingo, the best of *swimmers*, postpone a *massacre*, because the rivers were full of water! What could have been more to their purpose? Besides if such a confession was made, what possible motive could the functionaries have had for concealing it? If they were hostile to the mulattoes, why did they not prosecute those who were informed against? If they were friendly, why did they execute Ogé after such a confession—or rather, why had they reclaimed him from the Spaniards and then condemned him to be broken alive on the wheel?

The whole machinery by which the Amis des Noirs caused their incendiary doctrines to act upon the slaves of St. Domingo, melts away into moonshine. The mulattoes were the connecting link, the conductor,—and they turn out to have been a non-conductor. So the insurrection on the very facts of Edwards himself can have been the fruit of nothing but the mad oppression of the slaveholders.

We must here record our regret that we have failed, after a diligent search to find copies of the principal French writers on the revolutionary history of St. Domingo. We

strongly suspect it would be their united testimony, that the Amis des Noirs had not the slightest agency in the affair of Ogé. Appended to the "*Slave King*," a romance translated from the French of Victor Hugo, is a historical sketch of Saint Domingo, "by a gentleman intimately acquainted with the colony."*

From this sketch, which possesses the merit of self-consistency, if not the authority of its author's name, it appears that Vincent (not James) Ogé was one of the *delegates* whom the colored people had sent to Paris to plead their cause, that he there urged an open recognition of their rights, that after obtaining the decree of March 28th, he talked so boastingly both in Paris and London, of a recourse to arms, should the decree not be carried into execution, as to create the opinion among the planters then in Paris, that if he had not departed with a full supply of warlike stores, he had sailed to America either with money or letters of credit to procure them. Under this apprehension, the planters procured an order from the minister of marine to hinder the embarking of other colored persons from France, and to prohibit the landing of any whatever in the colony. It would seem that Ogé, in all his boasts, relied not on his means, but upon his influence with the colored people, and that his sailing from London via New-England, was a mere matter of convenience. Being apprized of the prohibitory orders before his arrival home, he was on his guard. His compatriots received him with open arms, being justly indignant at the obstacles which the whites had opposed to his landing. His partizans were composed of the richest and most respectable of his class, 300 of whom rallied around him in arms in a few days. (Whether arms were brought from New-England by Ogé or not, it is not probable that these mulattoes could have lacked them, as their own class composed the militia of the country.) The following is the letter which Ogé addressed to the *president of the assembly of the Cape*. Its style is certainly respectful, and it has nothing to do with the *Code Noir*.

"SIRS—A prejudice, for a long time upheld, is at last about to fall. Charged with a commission, honorable to myself, I call upon you to proclaim throughout the colony

* Library of Romance, edited by Leitch Ritchie, vol. 6.

the decree of the national assembly of the 28th of March, which gives without distinction, to *every free citizen* the right of being admitted to all duties and functions whatever. My pretensions are just; and I hope you will regard them. *I shall not have recourse to any raising of the slave gangs*; it is not necessary, and would be unworthy of me. I wish you to appreciate duly the purity of my intentions. When I solicited of the national assembly the decree I obtained, in favor of our American colonists, known under the hitherto injurious distinction of the mixed race, *I never comprehended in my claims the negroes in a state of slavery.* You and our adversaries have mixed this with my proceedings, to destroy my estimation in the minds of well disposed people; but, I have demanded only concessions for a class of freemen, who have endured the yoke of your oppression for two centuries. We have no wish but the execution of the decree of the 28th of March: we insist on its promulgation; and we cease not to repeat to our friends, that our adversaries are not merely unjust to us, but to themselves; for they do not seem to know *that their interests are one with ours.* Before employing the means at my command, I will see what good temper will do, but if, contrary to my object, you refuse what is asked, I will not answer for those disorders, which may arise from merited revenge."

The result has been already stated. The barbarous execution of Ogé and his companions consecrated them as the martyrs of their cause.

"This act of Ogé," says the author of the notes referred to, "was a mere deed of daring. There was no organized conspiracy—no scheme of revolt *concocted by influential friends in Europe*—no preparation for a conflict in arms. He came heated from the adventures of menacing mobs at Paris, where he had seen the monarch and the aristocracy prostrate in the dust with the people. His object was to profit by the panic which filled all men's minds. To make an appeal to their reason was useless; or, as he himself sneeringly expresses it in a letter to M. de Vincent, 'Who ever consulted the nobles and the clergy to redress the thousand and one abuses which existed in France?' In this single remark, we have the clear revelation of all his impulses."

The reader will not fail to perceive the bearing of these

statements upon the credibility of Bryan Edwards. The latter took his *facts* from the *white* planters of St. Domingo,* and his philosophy from the British West India Committee.

The spark that occasioned the dreadful explosion was struck out by the planters themselves. When they broke Vincent Ogé and Chavannes on the wheel, and gibbeted twenty of their followers, they taught the slaves a lesson, which in less than six months they showed themselves to have well learned by sticking upon poles along the road-side in this very spot 300 heads of their teachers.

Here let it be remarked, that the horrors of this insurrection took their type from the sanguinary character of the oppression. The death of Ogé was not the only lesson. Edwards himself details outrages committed by the whites before the massacre of 1791, which threw the rebellious negroes far in the shade—or rather in the sun-shine. One of them especially, was so shockingly indecent that he veils it in a learned tongue. p. 57. Neither were the blacks alone in their barbarity after they had commenced their bloody work. Thewhites out did them in horrors, while those horrors do not seem to have been relieved, as we are assured by Edwards those perpetrated by the blacks were, by instances of compassion and pardon. Two of the insurgents were *broken alive* under our author's own windows, while he was at the Cape. Of one he says, "when the executioner after breaking his legs and arms, lifted up the instrument to give the finishing stroke on the breast, and which (by putting the criminal out of pain) is called *le coup de grace*, the mob, with the ferociousness of cannibals called out, *arretéz !* [stop,] and compelled him to leave his work unfinished. In that condition the miserable wretch, with his broken limbs doubled up, was put on a cart wheel, which was placed horizontally, one end of the axletree being driven into the earth. He seemed perfectly sensible, but uttered not a groan. At the end of forty minutes, some English seamen, who were spectators of the tragedy, strangled him

* Edwards relies so implicitly upon the planters for his information, that he swallows the pretended confession of James Ogé on the strength of a mere *copy* transmitted to him at London, in 1795, by a planter *who sought to attach the colony to the British*. Edwards himself was at the Cape at the very time when the "secret" was brought out by the colonial assembly. Why did he not examine the original? He also mistakes *James* the accessory, for *Vincent* the principal.

in mercy. As to all the French spectators (many of whom were persons of fashion, who beheld the scene from the windows of their upper apartments, it grieves me to say, that they looked on with the most perfect composure and *sang froid*. Some of the *ladies*, I was told, even ridiculed with a great deal of unseemly mirth, the sympathy manifested by the English at the sufferings of the wretched criminals." p. 78. This was done by men professing to be enlightened christians! Yet these are the men who have had our sympathy, while the character of their poor victims has been branded with *all* the "horrors of insurrection."

It would be easy, on this topic, to multiply indefinitely facts which show that the negroes of St. Domingo had been for ages in a *school of horrors*. We will confine ourselves however to a single anecdote which is perfectly and painfully characteristic of the system under which in our own country as well as in St. Domingo, human beings are trained up for the "horrors of insurrection." An American lady who was in St. Domingo in 1802-3 attached to the army of General Le Clerc, thus speaks of the state of society there before the revolution.*

"I have become acquainted with some Creole ladies who, having staid in the island during the revolution, relate their sufferings in a manner that harrows up the soul; and dwell on the recollection of their long lost happiness with melancholy delight. St. Domingo was formerly a garden. Every inhabitant lived on his estate like a sovereign *ruling his slaves with despotic sway*, enjoying all that luxury could invent, or fortune procure.

"The pleasures of the table were carried to the last degree of refinement. Gaming knew no bounds, and libertinism, called love, was without restraint. The Creole is generous, hospitable, magnificent, but vain, inconstant, and incapable of serious application; and in this abode of pleasure and luxurious ease, vices have reigned at which humanity must shudder. The jealousy of the women was often ter-

* "Secret History; or, the Horrors of St. Domingo in a series of letters, written by a Lady at Cape François, to Colonel Burr, late Vice President of the United States," Philadelphia, 1803. This work of a sadly miseducated female, is chiefly occupied with the love affairs of her sister, the wife of a French officer. The writer, however, in the simplicity of her prejudice, exposes so many *facts*, that her book might well enough have been entitled, *The Secret of the Horrors of St. Domingo*.

rible in its consequences. One lady who had a beautiful negro girl continually about her person, thought she saw some symptoms of *tendresse* in the eyes of her husband, and all the fires of jealousy seized her soul.

"She ordered one of her slaves to cut off the head of the unfortunate victim, which was instantly done. At dinner her husband said he felt no disposition to eat, to which his wife with the air of a demon, replied, perhaps I can give you something that will excite your appetite; it has at least had that effect before. She rose and drew from a closet the head of Coomba. The husband shocked beyond expression, left the house and sailed immediately for France, in order never again to behold such a monster."

If the abominable tyranny of the white planters was abundantly sufficient to excite their victims to insurrection, their perfidy was no less so to keep them in that state. The mulattoes, many of them being slaveholders themselves, were naturally inclined to take part against the revolted slaves, and in some instances they did so. But many of them, seeing the insurrection successful, reluctantly adopted it as the means of obtaining their own ends. In the western or rather central part of the colony, they appeared with the revolted slaves in great force against Port au Prince. The whites soon came to terms. On the 11th of September, the *concordat*, already referred to, was signed, by which the planters of Port au Prince granted to the mulattoes all that was claimed by Ogé, and declared the punishment of that chief an execrable crime, *and the cause of all the misfortunes which for the last 19 days had desolated the plains and the mountains of the north!* This instrument was ratified by the colonial assembly on the 20th of the same month, that body now declaring that it would no longer oppose the decree of the 15th May, in favor of the mulattoes. These were the same men who sixteen months before declared they "would rather *die* than divide their political rights with a *bastard and degenerate race*" (a race of their own begetting!) "These concessions, at an earlier period," says Edwards, "would have operated with powerful effect in the salvation of the colony; but they now came too late, and produced only a partial truce, a temporary and fallacious cessation of miseries,"—a remark worthy of all remembrance—a lack of just, equal and

timely concessions, was truly the cause of all the horrors of St. Domingo; but in this instance the fault was not that the concession came *too late*; it was made in bad faith. Its only object was to disarm the mulattoes till their humble allies, the negroes, could be conquered, and then, as the result proved, it was to be taken back. At the very time when the whites and mulattoes in St. Domingo, were signing their concordat, the ill-starred national assembly, in France, was rescinding its decree of the 15th of May! No sooner had this act been confirmed to the colonial assembly at Cape François, by the arrival of commissioners to keep the peace, than in contravention of the will of those commissioners, they issued an order for "disarming the whole colored population—a population which, by the testimony of contemporary writers, had, from the moment that their just rights were acquiesced in by the colonists, fought against the rebel slaves with all the zeal that the interests of property could inspire."* This threw the mulattoes at once into a coalition with the insurgent slaves, who were before that occurrence fast dwindling away. Concession to both classes, even at the eleventh hour, would have put an end to the "horrors;" but the whites preferred their continuance to a loss of their unjust power.

Edwards dwells upon the diabolical cruelties that now occurred on both sides, with a minuteness of detail scarcely less atrocious than the spirit in which they were perpetrated. After describing the barbarous outrages of the mulattoes upon the family of a M. Sejourné, near Jeremie, he exclaims, "Such are thy triumphs, philanthropy!" On the very next page he gives the letter of the *Abbe Gregoire*, the grand ring-leader of the "exciters of this rebellion," the man who had stirred up the mulattoes to wade through all this blood. And what is the language of this blood-thirsty man to these very mulattoes? He says, "Doubtless you will be permitted to shed tears over the ashes of *Ferrand de Beaudiere*, and the unfortunate *Ogé*, assassinated under the forms of law, and dying on the wheel for having wished to be free! *But may he among you perish, who shall dare to entertain an idea of revenge against your persecutors!* They are already delivered over to the stings of their own

consciences, and covered with eternal infamy. The abhorrence in which they are held by the present race of mankind, only precedes the execration of posterity. Bury then in eternal oblivion every sentiment of hatred, and taste the delicious pleasure of conferring benefits on your oppressors. Repress even too marked expressions of your joy,* which, in causing them to reflect on their own injustice towards you, will make their remorse still more pungent."

II. THE HORRORS OF EMANCIPATION.

These "horrors" are commonly supposed to have *preceded*, or to have been *mixed up* with, those on which we have dwelt in the preceding pages. Without a popular misapprehension of this sort, "the Horrors of St. Domingo" would have been truly a good-for-nothing argument against the abolition of slavery. To make the argument of any use, it was necessary to persuade the public either that emancipation itself, or the efforts made to obtain it, were the direct cause of the insurrection. The fact of the existence of such a persuasion is more obvious than the means by which it was produced. To ninety-nine men in every hundred, probably, a more astonishing revelation could hardly be made, than that the great and only† insurrection in St. Domingo took place *before* any emancipation had been effected or thought of. The light, of this important fact, however, is beginning to shine and do its work.

On the 4th of April, 1792, the French national assembly again extended to the mulattoes and free negroes the rights of citizenship. To carry this decree into force and to punish the disturbers of the colony, three commissioners, Messrs. Santhonax, Polverel, and Ailhaud were sent out with a force of 8,000 men. The decree under which they were appointed, had nothing to do with emancipation, and the commissioners disclaimed any intention to emancipate. One of the objects which they were sent to accomplish was, to reduce the revolted negroes who had established themselves in the mountains. The commissioners, however, met with great resistance on the part of the white planters,

* This letter bears date, Paris 8th of June, 1791, and was addressed to the citizens of color in the French West Indies, concerning the decree of the 15th of May.

† We except of course some trifling disturbances of very ancient date.

who struggled to the last against admitting the free colored class to a share of their political rights. It was not till the beginning of 1793, that they had established their authority over the whole island. In the last resort the whites succeeded in procuring a new governor of their own party in the place of Desparbes who had resigned. This was M. Galbaud. He arrived at Cape François on the 7th of May, 1793, and entered immediately upon his government to the great joy of the white aristocracy. His first act was to declare his independence of the civil commissioners, who were then engaged in quelling disturbances in the West and South. On the 10th of June they returned to the Cape, and entered upon an examination of the credentials of the new governor. There was a decree of the national assembly that no proprietor of an estate in the West Indies should hold the government of the colony in which his estate was situated. Galbaud had a coffee plantation in St. Domingo, and was unable to give any satisfactory reason why he had not informed the Executive Council of this fact before accepting the appointment.* The commissioners ordered him immediately to return to France. Galbaud rallied his partizans and attacked the commissioners in the government house, with two or three thousand men. Now it was, that "the horrors of emancipation" commenced. Says Edwards, "a scene now opens, which, if it does not obliterate, exceeds at least, all that has hitherto been related of factions, anarchy, and savage cruelty, in this unfortunate colony."

And what was this new and unexampled "horror"? The commissioners despatched an agent to call in to their aid the revolted negroes, promising them *pardon for the past, freedom for the future*, AND THE PLUNDER OF THE CITY.† Surely this was a charter broad enough to warrant a very liberal enactment of "horrors" on the part of the rebels. "The rebel generals, *Jean François* and *Biassou*," says Edwards, "rejected their offers; but on the 21st about noon, (just after that Galbaud and most of his adherents,

* Bryan Edwards, page 115.

† Clarkson, on the authority of the French historians gives these commissioners no agency in calling in the insurgent negroes, but states that *after* the destruction of the Cape, they proclaimed freedom to the slaves in the neighborhood who would range themselves under the banner of the republic.

finding their cause hopeless, had retired to the ships) a negro chief called *Macaya*, with upwards of three thousand of the revolted slaves, entered the town, and began an universal and indiscriminate slaughter of men, women, and children. The white inhabitants fled from all quarters to the sea-side, in hopes of finding shelter with the governor on board the ships in the harbor; but a body of the mulattoes cut off their retreat, and a horrid butchery ensued, a description of which every heart susceptible of humanity must be unable to bear. Suffice it to say, that the slaughter continued with unremitting fury from the 21st to the evening of the 23d; when the savages having murdered all the white inhabitants that fell in their way, set fire to the buildings; and more than half the city was consumed by the flames. The commissioners, themselves, either terrified at beholding the lamentable and extensive mischief which they had occasioned, or afraid to trust their persons with their rebel allies, sought protection under the cover of a ship of the line," (p. 116.) This candid and christian author having detailed so dreadful an effect of what he would have his readers believe an act of emancipation, passes on to the more "pleasing task of rendering due homage to the gallant and enterprising spirit of (his) countrymen in their noble—but alas! hitherto unavailing—endeavors to restore *peace, subordination, and good government* on this theatre of anarchy and bloodshed," i. e. he narrates the efforts of the British to secure *slavery* and make the colony their own.

Galbaud and a troop of adherents came to the United States, to tell the story of the massacre, burning and plundering of Cape François as one of "the horrors of *emancipation*!" By these precious defenders of "good government" it was, that hundreds of our good republicans were taught, "if you free the slaves they will turn round and cut their master's throats. Oh yes, has it not been proved in St. Domingo?" On these horrors we have not a word of comment to offer, having no disposition to deny that rebel slaves will cut their master's throats when invited to.

The promise of *freedom* to the revolted slaves who should resort to the standard of the republic was evidently a step towards a general emancipation, and rendered that event well nigh inevitable. The peaceable slaves, who wished for liberty, had now only to come to the camp of the com-

missioners by the way of the mountains. But the grand result was suddenly brought about by the appearance of a mighty antagonist on the side of the masters. As early as 1791, many of the planters had made application to the King of Great Britain, to take possession of the colony, but as this was before the commencement of hostilities between the latter and France, their application was treated with neglect. Not so in 1793. In the summer of that year, the Governor of Jamaica was directed to accept terms of capitulation from such of the inhabitants of St. Domingo as wished for the protection of the British government, and to send a detachment of troops sufficient to keep possession of the places surrendered till *reinforcements* should arrive from England.* The military force under the command of the republican commissioners, amounted to 22,000 men, but was so dispersed as to present no formidable obstacle to an invasion. The moment, therefore, they heard of the designs of the British, they turned their minds to the very natural expedient of making peace with the slaves. To do this effectually, it was necessary to promise freedom to all who should take sides with the republic against the British. This is what our pro-slavery historian calls "the most desperate expedient, to strengthen their party, that imagination can conceive." His account of the horrors of this rash and desperate act is too amusing to be omitted. "From this moment it might have been foreseen that the colony was lost to Europe ; for though but few of the negroes, in proportion to the whole, joined the commissioners, many thousands choosing to continue slaves as they were, and participate in the fortunes of their masters ; yet vast numbers in all parts of the colony (apprehensive probably that this offer of liberty was too great a favor to be permanent) availed themselves of it to secure a retreat to the mountains, and possess themselves of the natural fortresses, which the interior country affords. Successive bodies have since joined them, and it is believed that upwards of 100,000 have established themselves in those recesses, into a sort of savage *republic*, (oh the savages !) like that of the black Charaibes of St. Vincent, where they subsist on the spontaneous fruits of the earth, and the wild cattle which they procure by

* Bryan Edwards, page 140.

hunting, *prudently declining offensive war*, and trusting their safety to the rocky fortresses which nature has raised around them, and from which, in my opinion, it will be *no easy undertaking to dislodge them*"!

Such is the representation given by Edwards of the first decree of emancipation. To understand more distinctly the facts to which he refers, it is necessary to remark, that after the affair of the Cape, Polverel left Santhonax there, and proceeded in his capacity of commissioner to Port au Prince and Les Cayes. In both the West and the South he found all quiet, and cultivation flourishing. As soon, however, as the slaves had heard of what had taken place at the Cape they became much excited, and it appeared certain that the safety of the planters as well as the public peace required that emancipation should be extended throughout the island. On the 27th of August, Polverel issued his proclamation from Les Cayes, declaring, that to encourage the negroes to assist in repelling the British, all manner of slavery was abolished, and the negroes were thenceforward to consider themselves as free citizens. He expatiates upon the necessity of labor, requires the negroes to engage in their usual labors from year to year, but gives them the liberty of choosing their own masters. One-third of the crop was to be theirs as a reward of their labor. "The whole," says our candid historian, "appears to have been a matchless piece of absurdity; betraying a lamentable degree of ignorance concerning the manners and dispositions of the negroes, and *totally impracticable in itself*"! How fearfully horrible! And how sad to relate, that even its total impracticability did not prevent its complete success! Both at Les Cayes and Port au Prince, Polverel opened registries for the names of the planters who concurred in the measure: and, strange to tell, in the former place, nearly all, and in the latter a large majority subscribed their names as supporters of this "matchless piece of absurdity." It was from this fatal blunder of Polverel and the planters, all so lamentably ignorant of the negro character, that those horrors resulted which Bryan Edwards has so pathetically described. The act of emancipation kindled the patriotism of the negroes to such a degree, that the British labored in vain to introduce their "good government." "The colony was lost to Europe." We will not here anticipate what belongs to the

"horrors" of idleness and of the Code Rural; suffice it to say, that neither at this time nor afterwards, when the national assembly abolished slavery in all the French colonies, was a *drop of blood spilled!* The very men who had raged like bloody-mouthed tigers before the proclamation, were after it mere lambs. The worst crime that even Bryan Edwards can accuse them of committing, is *running to the mountains*, there to establish a "savage republic;" and the greatest "horror" which even his fruitful imagination can portray, is that it will be "no easy matter to dislodge them"—no easy matter again to reduce them to bondage! So, indeed, it proved to be.

It is worthy of remark that the real "horrors" of emancipation rest on positive as well as negative testimony. Not only is there an entire absence of *evil* chargeable to emancipation, but there are witnesses, and witnesses of the highest respectability, and of the most perfect opportunity of information, who directly testify that the effect of emancipation was *good*, and only *good*. These witnesses are the planters themselves! Says Col. Malenfant, a wealthy planter who resided on the island at the time, "After this public act of emancipation, the negroes remained *quiet*, both in the South and in the West, and they continued to *work* upon all the plantations. There were estates indeed which had neither owners nor managers resident upon them, for some of these had been put in prison by Montbrun; and others fearing the same fate had fled to the quarter which had just been given up to the English, yet upon these estates though abandoned, the negroes continued their labors, where there were any even inferior agents to guide them; and on the estates where no white men were left to direct them, they betook themselves to the *planting of provisions*. But upon all the plantations where the whites resided, the blacks continued to labor *as quietly as before*." p. 58.* This was upon the first impetuous gush of the new liberty; perhaps we shall find something more dreadful further on. No. But we find more of the same absurd *quietness*, more of the same impracticable working for wages, more of the same prudence in declining all such "offensive" work as

* See "Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the state of the West India Colonies." p. 841, 842.

cutting their masters' throats. The same witness a little further on in his work ridicules the notion of the French, that the negroes would work by no motive but compulsion, and in reference to those liberated by the proclamations aforesaid, asks, "How did Toussaint succeed? How did I succeed also, before his time, in the plain of Cul de Sac, and on the plantation Gouraud, more than eight months after liberty had been granted to the slaves? Let those who knew me at that time, and even the blacks themselves be asked. They will all reply that not a single negro upon the plantation, consisting of more than four hundred and fifty laborers refused to work; and yet this plantation was thought to be under the worst discipline, and the slaves the most idle of any in the plain. I myself inspired the same activity into three other plantations of which I had the management." p. 125, 126. Again, "If you will take care not to speak to them of their return to slavery, but talk to them about their *liberty*, you may with this latter word chain them down to their labor." p. 125. Such is the positive testimony we have of the good conduct of the emancipated slaves for sometime after their release. If we do not see the ruinous effects of slavery entirely obliterated, in the years that followed, if during the years 1794, 5 and 6, St. Domingo was still in *trouble*, we must remember that it was then the field upon which the British expended some thousands of lives, and some millions of money to restore the "good government" of the planters. Time would fail us to recount the smoking and desolate monuments of British valor, which were erected wherever the similar monuments of the old oppression had left room for them, but none of them should be charged to emancipation. In 1796 Toussaint came into power. He was himself a living evidence of the effect of emancipation, being a full-blooded negro, and having been a slave. Whatever may have been the means by which he effected it, there was under his administration, in spite of the lingering efforts of the British and the disturbance of rival chieftains, a most flourishing state of the colony. Says Malenfant, before quoted, "The colony flourished under Toussaint. The whites lived happily and in *peace* upon their estates, and the negroes continued to work for them." p. 78. Toussaint continued in power from 1796 till 1802, six years, and Malenfant repeatedly affirms, that during that period

the white planters kept peaceable possession of their estates, and the blacks worked for them.

General Pamphile de la Croix, who published in 1819, his "Memoirs for a history of St. Domingo," informs us that when Santhonax, who had been recalled to France by the government, returned to the colony in 1798, "he was astonished at the state in which he found it." "This," says La Croix, "was owing to Toussaint, who while he had succeeded in establishing perfect order and discipline among the black troops, had succeeded also in making the black laborers return to the plantations, there to resume cultivation." p. 311. The same author tells us that in the next year, 1797, the most wonderful progress had been made in agriculture. "The colony," says he, "marched, as by enchantment towards its ancient splendor; cultivation prospered; every day produced perceptible proofs of its progress. The city of the Cape, and the plantations of the North, rose up again visibly to the eye." p. 324. All this in spite of the horrors of emancipation!

"General Vincent, who still lives in Paris, was a Colonel, and afterwards a General of Brigade in St. Domingo. He was there during the time, both of Santhonax and of Toussaint. He was also proprietor of estates there. He assisted in planning the scheme of its agriculture, after the abolition of slavery, and was one of the great instruments in bringing it to perfection. In the year 1801, he was sent by Toussaint to Paris, to lay before Bonaparte the new constitution that had been agreed upon in St. Domingo, and arrived there at the moment of the peace of Amiens. Here he found to his surprise and grief, that Bonaparte was preparing an immense armament for restoring slavery in St. Domingo. He lost no time in seeing the first consul, and had the courage to remonstrate against the expedition; telling him that his army would most assuredly be destroyed by the climate of St. Domingo,* even if it could be doubted whether it would be destroyed by the blacks. He stated, as another argument against the expedition, that it was totally unnecessary, for that *every thing was going on well in St. Domingo; the proprietors were in peaceable possession of*

* The worst possible argument with the First Consul, inasmuch as he wished the world to be rid of the sturdy republicans he was about to send, before he assumed the imperial purple.

their estates ; cultivation was making a rapid progress ; the blacks were industrious, and orderly and happy. He conjured him, therefore, not to reverse the satisfactory state of things. But his efforts were ineffectual. The mind of Bonaparte had been poisoned by the misrepresentation of the colonists.*

To estimate the effect of the emancipation of the slaves in 1794 upon the prosperity of the island, we must carefully distinguish between it and other causes that were operating at the same time. 1. The civil wars and the insurrection, that occurred *before* emancipation was thought of, had destroyed a vast amount of capital. In the year 1791, between the 23d of August and the 16th of October, 1,132 sugar, coffee, cotton and indigo plantations are said to have been utterly destroyed, being more than one-seventh of all in the French part of the island ; and these plantations probably embraced a much larger proportion of the agricultural capital of that part, being situated in the most fertile districts, and belonging to the wealthiest of the white planters. Up to the act of emancipation, the destruction was going forward. Much that escaped the fire was ruined by the desertion of the laborers. It is hardly to be supposed that less than two-thirds of the agricultural capital (exclusive of the soil) could have been destroyed during the interval from the rising of the slaves to the general act of emancipation in 1794. 2. The invasion of the British which immediately ensued, and which kept the country in continual agitation from St. Nicholas Mole to Cape Tiburon, must at least have prevented any general amendment of the estates. We have reason to believe that till Toussaint came into power in 1796, there was a continual waste of capital. The British did not evacuate the island till the close of 1798. From that time Toussaint turned his attention to the revival of agriculture ; with what success will appear from the following statistics :—

AVERAGE EXPORTS FROM THE FRENCH PART OF ST.
DOMINGO, BEFORE THE REVOLUTION.

Sugar,	-	-	-	-	145,192,043 lbs.
Coffee,	-	-	-	-	71,663,187 lbs.

* This account was received by Mr. Clarkson, from General Vincent himself. See Report of the Committee of the House of Lords, 1832. p. 842.

Cotton,	-	-	-	-	6,698,858 lbs.
Indigo,	-	-	-	-	951,607 lbs.
Molasses,	-	-	-	-	23,061 Hhds.
Taffia, (a sort of Rum,)	-	-	-	-	2,600 Hhds.

THE MAXIMUM EXPORTS IN ONE YEAR UNDER
TOUSSAINT.

Sugar,	-	-	-	-	53,400,000 lbs.
Coffee,	-	-	-	-	34,370,000 lbs.
Cotton,	-	-	-	-	4,050,000 lbs.
Cocoa,	-	-	-	-	234,600 lbs.
Indigo,	-	-	-	-	37,600 lbs.
Molasses,	-	-	-	-	9,128 Hhds.*

Before the revolution there were 450,000 slave laborers, working with a capital, in the shape of buildings, mills, fixtures and implements, which had been accumulating for ages of prosperity. Under Toussaint there were 290,000 free laborers, many of them just from the army or the mountains, working on plantations that had undergone the horrors of the insurrection and a seven years' war. Yet in less than three years, Toussaint had brought the colony to such a state of cultivation, that the old planters themselves were astonished and exclaimed, "the colony is marching as if by enchantment towards its ancient splendor;"—he had increased the exports from almost nothing to nearly half those of the best days of the old dominion of the whip. Now, in behalf of emancipation we have a right to claim that its fruits shall be judged by the prosperity of this period, rather than the present. Even here it labors under disadvantages, but another cause was yet to operate in St. Domingo which threw society back almost to its original elements. The agricultural capital, especially that pertaining to the cultivation of sugar, was to be swept away, and with it the white race, comprising most of the experience necessary for its management. Under another head we shall have occasion to enquire what were the effects of this new cause. At present it is sufficient to remark, that no argument adverse to emancipation can be drawn from the present state of Hayti

* The first of these tables was drawn up by Bryan Edwards, the second we find in Franklin's work on Hayti. Both are advocates of slavery.

inasmuch as the white planters are no longer parties. Emancipation supposes merely a change in the relation of the laborer to his employer—the substitution of rewards for coercion. Under Toussaint's administration the white planters were protected. The former slaves labored for them for wages or shares in the produce. Had the agricultural capital remained the same as under the old order of things, there would have been a tolerably fair experiment of the effects of emancipation. We are well aware that the advocates of slavery have accused Toussaint of relieving the "horrors of emancipation," by introducing a system of coercion more rigid than slavery itself. This is equivalent to a concession that the results of industry under his system were quite satisfactory, and brings us to the consideration of

III. THE HORRORS OF THE CODE RURAL.

When we advocate the entire and immediate overthrow of slavery, we are told to remember "the horrors of St. Domingo." Yes, we reply, we will not forget the "horrors;" but look you at the quiet, and productive industry which quickly succeeded these horrors. Ah! exclaims the advocates of slavery, that industry was all the effect of *coercion* worse than slavery itself! So it seems, after all, that Hayti has furnished, not an experiment of *freedom*, but of *coercion* worse than slavery. As the principles of the code rural were embraced in that "matchless piece of absurdity," the first proclamation of Polverel, and have been acted on ever since, it appears that there has never been in St. Domingo or Hayti any such thing as emancipation at all! We leave it to the believers in the horrors of the code rural, to show how St. Domingo, where slavery according to their argument was never abolished, proves any thing against the abolition of slavery!

The common apprehension of the matter is that emancipation was tried and when it was found that the laborers would not work freely they were forced to work by the lash or the *bayonet* according to the rules of a most tyrannous and sanguinary Code Rural. In our last number we gave a comprehensive abstract both of the agricultural code of Polverel which was coeval with emancipation itself, and of that of Toussaint, under which the "colony marched, as

by enchantment towards its ancient splendor." In both of them the cultivators were left free to choose the proprietors under whom they would labor, in both they were to receive a compensation for their labor which depended much upon their own industry, and not at all upon the will of the proprietor; in neither of them could they be punished arbitrarily or without trial. There was nothing in either of these codes more severe than our own enactments against vagrancy and idleness. The citizens who had no other means of support must work some where, and work to some purpose, but they might choose for themselves where they would work, and the avails were fully secured to them. But it is said that these laws were barbarously executed, that in point of fact, the system of coercion was even worse than that of slavery. To set this matter in its true light, we will give the words of James Franklin, the paid historian of "the West India Committee," in his "*Present state of Hayti*." He says of the latter of the two codes above referred to, "When this law was promulgated, Toussaint began to exert the power he possessed to enforce it, and cultivation began to raise its head in a most eminent degree. The sugar estates exhibited labor going on with the same spirit and success as in former times; the coffee settlements displayed a busy scene in every direction throughout the colony; and the cotton and cocoa plantations showed that they were not to be neglected in the midst of this animated and interesting struggle for the revival of a country's greatness and a nation's wealth. *But here coercion did the work*, here was compulsory labor resorted to, because it was *sanctioned by the law*, and those who held the power were more than equal to those that felt a disposition to resist it. The *whip*, that *symbol of office* (what an elegant euphemism!) of the principal negro, was dispensed with, it is true, but the cultivators were placed under the apprehension of a more effective weapon, for they were attended through the day by a *military guard*, and the *bayonet* and the *sabre* superseded the cat and the lash. To the astonishment of the leading people in the country (the old white planters of course,) the cultivators submitted to the coercion without a murmur; and it was not till French intrigue was industriously set to work to instil into their minds that their condition was worse than when they were slaves, that any dispo-

sition was shewn to oppose the principle of compulsory labor; and even this opposition was far from being general. When we take into consideration that the population under Toussaint had greatly diminished, and that the cultivators in his time exceeded very little more than half of the slaves that were employed in agriculture in the time of the French, and compare the returns of produce at the respective periods, it must be evident that the system of coercion resorted to by Toussaint, *must have been to the full as rigid as that which existed at any former period*, or it would have been impossible for him to have carried on cultivation to so great an extent." Much as we pity this pro-slavery *beggar*, we cannot yield the *question* to his importunity. On his principle, if we "compare the returns of produce" in Ohio and Kentucky we must at once be convinced that "the system of coercion resorted to" in the former is far more "rigid" than that in the latter. We are not prepared to concede to Mr. Franklin that he has made out any system of *coercion* at all, so far as the *amount of labor* is concerned. It is true that every person not otherwise employed or not able to subsist on the avails of his property, being in good health, was compelled to be industriously employed during nine hours of each day, but it was left to the *compensation* to stimulate his muscles while in the field. What signified the "bayonet and the sabre"? Does Mr. James Franklin mean to have us understand, that when his gentlemen of the "military guard" saw a loiterer or one whose strength was not equal to his row, they could lay the sabre on his back as the "principal negro" used to his "symbol of office"; or that when they saw a tired laborer sit down under the shade to rest himself, they could rouse him to his toil by punching him with the bayonet under the fifth rib? Would the cultivators have submitted to any such system without a murmur? The truth is, Franklin utterly mistakes the purpose of the "military guard." It was placed on the plantation as much to coerce the proprietor as the cultivator. The whole system of Toussaint was military, because it originated in war. When a civil or constabulary force was wanted to maintain the law between proprietors and cultivators none was at hand. But there was a well organized military, a force that Toussaint thought it necessary to keep well organized. He, therefore, placed upon each

estate a small military guard, with *their* "symbols of office," whose business it was, not to administer punishment, for this the law did not allow them to do in any case, but to protect the rights of the laborer as well as the proprietor, by bringing the parties before the proper tribunal in case of any tumult or complaint. The *coercion* exercised by the military guard was nothing more nor less than the *coercion* of the law, the only penalties of which were "pecuniary fines, imprisonment, and labor on the public works." So much for the "horrors of the bayonet" under the terrible reign of 'Toussaint. It is quite apparent why the French could never succeed in convincing any considerable portion of the cultivators "that their condition was worse than when they were slaves." It is to be remembered that the contracts between the proprietors and cultivators were only for a term of three years, and either party could withdraw by giving a year's notice. Any considerable dissatisfaction, especially on the side of the cultivators, would have brought the system into irretrievable confusion. That the proprietors were secretly dissatisfied is proved by their intrigues with Bonaparte for the restoration of slavery, but that they had little reason to be dissatisfied is proved by their bitter lamentations under Le Clerc and Rochambeau, with whom they were soon disgusted, regretting exceedingly that like the dog in the fable, they had dropped the sure advantages which they enjoyed under 'Toussaint for the shadowy and evanescent hope of greater gains under the restoration of the old regime. So thoroughly indeed were the planters convinced of the profitableness of their estates under the law and police of 'Toussaint, that when Rochambeau was at last driven from the island, and they had mostly embarked with their effects to fly with him, they gladly returned at great expense, because Dessalines offered to place them on the same footing as they had held under 'Toussaint. In this instance they had a more crafty and cruel chief to deal with, for Dessalines had no intention to nourish in his bosom the vipers that had proved so fatal to his generous predecessor. His offer only lured them to destruction. But their return under such circumstances speak volumes for 'Toussaint.

"Horrible" as were these codes of Polverel and 'Toussaint for the suppression of vagrancy, and the regulation of the rural police, we more than doubt, whether they were com-

plained of as coercive, while they were in force. It was not till the advocates of slavery felt the need of some new and powerful argument in support of the *necessity* of coercion, that they discovered "the horrors of the Code Rural." How convenient for them would it be, when pressed and worried beyond endurance by arguments against the folly and sin of slavery, to be able to turn to an experiment, where freedom had been tried and found wanting; where, as a last resort, to prevent starvation, the laborers were driven to the field by a military guard, with drum and fife and guns; where the whip and chain had only given place to the sabre, the bayonet and the dungeon. Oh yes, it would be just the thing, to show that the poor Haytians, with all their boasted liberty, had but jumped out of the frying pan into the fire. This interesting discovery was probably made by the slaveholders of Jamaica in 1826. In that year the agricultural laws of Hayti were revised by President Boyer, and published under the title of "The Code Rural." Some of the provisions of this code suggested to the Jamaica planters the idea of making an impression in favor of their own tyrannous system by representing that industry was maintained in Hayti only by the same principle, COERCION. It is worthy of remark, that the code rural itself was so little to their purpose, that they substituted in its place their own commentary, prefaced by a *forged* proclamation. Says the *British "Anti-Slavery Reporter,"* vol. I, p. 309, "On the 14th of October, 1826, there appeared in the Royal Gazette of Jamaica, a proclamation pretended to be issued in Hayti, by President Boyer in April or May, 1826; which, however, has proved to be a forged and fabricated document. It had in substance been issued by Toussaint L'Ouverture in 1799, under widely different circumstances; but it was now vamped up, and in a mutilated and garbled state palmed upon the public as a proof of the severe coercion which was requisite to obtain from the people of Hayti, in the present day, an adequate measure of industrious exertion.

"On the 9th of November, the subject of this proclamation was brought before the house of assembly by Mr. Atkinson. They had all seen, he said, a proclamation of the Haytian President,—a document which he considered of material assistance at the present period, when that house

was called upon to adopt a parcel of nonsensical measures for the regulation of our slave population, quite incompatible with their habits and customs. This proclamation was without date, but its contents specified that *compulsory labor* must be resorted to in the free state of Hayti, and this circumstance ought to be made known in England." Accordingly the house of assembly immediately despatched the proclamation with the extracts from the code rural which best suited their purpose to their agent in England, with directions to publish them and put them in the hands of every member of parliament. Detection did not travel so far behind this fraud as its perpetrators seem to have anticipated.* Still it served a purpose.

In the United States "the horrors of the Code Rural" have been plied with equal industry. Innumerable newspaper paragraphs have spread the delusion that this code is as cruel as the laws of Draco, or our own more abominable slave laws. The New-York Commercial Advertiser of September 24, 1834, practices the West India tactics to perfection. It says of Hayti, "The government has ever been despotic, and of necessity; and at last its power has been called forth for the regulation of labor—the labor of freemen, to prevent the island from going entirely to ruin." The following extract from a late Haytian enactment is in point, and will serve as a practical commentary upon the mad schemes of our well-meaning but deluded philanthropists.† The senate and chamber of representatives of Hayti have passed a Rural

* Mr. Hibbert, the agent of the West Indians was brought into a very unpleasant predicament by giving the finishing stroke to this forgery. The following is the explanation of this part of the business, offered by a pro-slavery witness before the Lords' Committee in 1832. "There was no signature to the copy of the proclamation that had been sent to Mr. Hibbert, and he, imagining it had been a mere clerical omission of the clerk of the committee of correspondence, when he published it, as he did by their direction, put the name of Boyer, the then President, at the bottom of it; This Mr. Hibbert stated in a letter he subsequently published." Of the "clerical omissions" in the document itself, we are not aware that any explanations were attempted. Mr. Hinchcliffe, the witness referred to, thus accounts for the singular fact that the proclamation was used at all. "There was a Code Rural conformable to that proclamation, though the proclamation itself had been the one issued, I believe, by Toussaint, thirty years before; and I can only suppose that it was, from Mr. Atkinson's explanations, that it had been sent down at that time, I think from Barbadoes to Jamaica, because it was giving in effect the substance of the Code Rural that had been issued!" [Report of the Lords' Committee, p. 21.] So it was all to save clerk hire! The economical West India nabobs, to save the expense of copying the 200 articles of the Code Rural, select 15 or 16, and give the "substance" of the rest by a proclamation thirty years old, clerically omitting the DATE and the NAME!!

† From the words, "The Senate &c." the Commercial Advertiser copies

Code, containing provisions which are without example in any nation. Their object is to compel the people to labor for their subsistence by inflicting penalties upon idleness. We have extracted the following articles, which render the condition of the free blacks of Hayti very little different from, [if not actually worse than the condition of the slaves in any part of the United States.]” Then follow seven insulated articles of the Code Rural,—some of the same that were sent from Jamaica to England, ahead of the code itself, and published by Mr. Hibbert. These articles, which we shall presently see are no more severe or compulsory than the statutes of Elizabeth and George III. for the same object, are as follows:—

“ART. 174. All persons who are not proprietors, or farmers in the place in which they reside, and shall not have engaged themselves to work for some proprietor or farmer shall be reported as vagabonds, shall be arrested by the rural police of the place in which they may be found, and brought before the justice of the peace of the district.

“ART. 177. If, after eight days detention they shall refuse to work, they shall be sent to labor on the public works, of the town or district in which they may be arrested, until they consent to work in the fields.

“ART. 180. Every laborer, who, on working days, and at the hours at which he ought to be employed, shall be found unoccupied, or walking upon the public ways, shall be considered as an idler, arrested as such, and brought before a justice of the peace, who, for the first offence may send him to prison for 24 hours; and for any repetition may send him to the public works.

“ART. 184. The ordinary labors in the field shall commence at day light, and continue till mid-day, with an interval of half an hour for breakfast; the labor shall be resumed at two o'clock, and continue till sun-set.

“ART. 185. Pregnant women shall be employed only upon

without giving credit, from the *New-York Courier and Enquirer* of June 26, 1834, all except the words we have enclosed in brackets. Instead of these words the *Courier and Enquirer* had [“the slaves in the colonies.”] Hence, as the latter *veracious* print has given no credit or date, we infer it stole the paragraph from some old English newspaper, probably one of those that gave publicity to the “clerical omission”-proclamation of Mr. Hibbert! The *Commercial* speaks of the enactment as “a late” one. The *Cacus* from whom he borrowed his extract dragged it into his den without a word about its age! Such is the honor and honesty of the American Press, where slavery is concerned!

light work, but after the fourth month of their pregnancy they shall not be compelled to work in the fields at all. [How different the practice in the United States!]

"ART. 186. Four months after their delivery they shall resume their labors in the fields, but shall not begin work until an hour after sun-rise, and continue until eleven o'clock, and shall work in the afternoon only from two o'clock till an hour before sun-set.

"ART. 190. Saturdays, Sundays, and Fête-days being entirely at the disposal of the laborers, they are not to be permitted to leave their work on other days, for the purposes of dancing or amusement, either day or night; the delinquents in such cases shall be liable to imprisonment for three days for the first offence, and for six days for every repetition of the offence."

No person, unless totally ignorant of our southern slave codes, could imagine that such regulations as these would make the condition of the subjects of them worse than, or any where nearly as bad as, that of the slaves in the United States. But when we turn to the code itself, we find it making abundant provision for the freedom of the laborer as well as the security of his compensation. The Code Rural consists of six general heads, or laws, which are divided into chapters, and subdivided into 202 articles. *The first law* describes the class of citizens who shall be required to devote themselves to agriculture, and states the exceptions. The 3d Article is as follows: "All the citizens being bound to give their aid towards supporting the state, either by their services or their industry; those who shall not be employed in civil offices, or called out on military service; those who shall not be engaged in any business subject to the patent;* those who shall not be employed as working artificers, or as domestic servants, those who shall not be employed in the cutting of wood for exportation; and those in fine, who shall not be able to show that they possess the means of subsistence, shall be bound to cultivate the earth." People are not permitted to leave the country and reside in towns, unless they can show that they have business or property that will support them. All fines and forfeitures under 100 dollars are inflicted by jus-

* A tax so named imposed on merchants, shop-keepers, tradesmen, &c.

tices of the peace, over that sum by the civil tribunals. By way of encouragement, prizes are to be awarded to the most successful cultivators. A full report of the state of agriculture, and suggestions of the best means of improving it, are required of the officers of the departments once every year. *The second law*, regulates "landmarks, boundaries and establishments;" it provides that the woods shall not be cut away in certain places, that the springs and fountains shall be planted around with trees to promote coolness, that fires shall not be kindled in the woods or old canes to the detriment of others, that cattle shall be kept from committing depredations, &c. &c. It also provides, that provisions shall be raised on each estate sufficient for all the laborers employed on it, that the cultivators who work for *one-fourth* of the produce shall have for their personal use a garden of provisions to be cultivated on leisure days, that the dikes, reservoirs and conduits for the purposes of irrigation shall be kept in repair by joint labor, &c. &c. *The third law* treats of the mutual contracts between the proprietors or principal renters, and the cultivators or laborers. The terms of contracts are different for different branches of business, ranging from six months to three years. The contracting parties are "at liberty to make such stipulations as they shall judge suitable, provided they do not contravene the regulations of the present code." Proprietors are not allowed to employ laborers without a written contract, nor to employ those whose previous contracts have not expired. When the contracts are made by laborers individually, the compensation received is one-fourth of the produce, aside from all expenses, and aside from the produce of the gardens specially allotted, to be divided among all the laborers. When the contract is made by an association of labors under a headman, the association is to receive one-half the produce. The periods are stated at which the avails shall be divided in the case of each crop. The 56th, 57th and 58th articles detail the mode in which the division shall be made, and are well worth perusal. "56. When the periods arrive for dividing the proceeds among the cultivators, the officer of the rural police of the section in which the plantation is situated, shall be called by the proprietor, chief renter, or their manager, to witness the division. The account of the articles manufactured, or other products

reaped, shall be exhibited, with a certificate of the price current, and one from the purchaser of the commodities mentioned in the last article. The list of persons entitled to share shall be settled, and the proceeds shall be reckoned up.

"57. Each of the co-sharers shall be inscribed in the Distribution List, according to their strength and activity and the time they have worked, either in the first, second, or third class. And the money to be shared shall be divided into quarter shares, half shares, and whole shares. The conductors of the labors contracted for at one fourth of the produce, and the head men of the associations laboring for a half, shall each have three whole shares. The head sugar-boilers, the head wagoners, and, in short, the head of each department of labor, shall have two shares. The good workers of the first class, whether men or women, shall have a share and a half; those of the second, one share; those of the third three quarters of a share; children from twelve to sixteen years of age, who have made themselves serviceable according to their capacities, and the old people who can only work moderately, half a share; and children from nine to eleven years, who have been occupied according to their age and strength, and infirm persons, shall have a quarter share. The broken money, arising from the formation of the shares, shall go to augment the portion of the laborers who shall have displayed the greatest punctuality and perseverance in their labors."

"58. There shall be furnished to the laborers daily tickets, to show the days they were present at work. Every week their daily tickets shall be withdrawn and replaced by weekly tickets, which shall be brought into account when the division of the money, arising from the crops, takes place."

Permits of absence may be given by the proprietors, renters, or managers, but not for a longer time than eight days—When a longer absence is desired the matter is referred to the commandant of the commune. The proprietors are to furnish the necessary tools. Regulations are made in regard to the sale of the produce. The whole expense of the management of the plantation is to be paid out of the share of the proprietor. By the 67th article "Proprietors or renters are bound, under penalty from five to fif-

teen dollars, to agree before hand with a medical practitioner if there be one in the commune, to look after their cultivators, and to furnish the necessary medicines; these medicines being furnished gratis to the cultivators contracting at a fourth; but being paid for at cost price, when furnished to associations working for half, or to under-tenants.

"63. Proprietors and chief renters of rural properties, must look to it that the infant children on the property shall be well taken care of. To this end one or more females shall be properly appointed to this charge, the remuneration for whose attention shall be paid by the cultivators, in proportion to the number of their children."

The obligations of the cultivators are also stated, they are to be "obedient and respectful to the proprietors and renters with whom they have contracted, as well as to the managers." They are to be punctual and not leave their labors without permission, except from Saturday morning till Monday at sunrise. They are to render their services in the transportation of the produce, the proprietor or chief renter furnishing the means of transport. Rules are enacted in regard to sub-contracts. Soldiers and other persons in the service of the state are allowed to cultivate on shares on the same terms as others; and they may also work by the week, the month, or the job if they prefer. This regulation is admirably adapted to counteract the evils of the large military establishment maintained in Hayti. This law closes with a chapter on "*the method of terminating difficulties between proprietors, renters, managers, cultivators, associated persons, sub-tenants, &c.*," which we fancy would look very oddly in any slave code. We quote it entire.

"81. When differences shall arise between agricultural proprietors, principal renters, managers, and cultivators, associated for a half, or sub-tenants, the parties shall first carry their complaints or claims before the officer of Rural Police of the section, who, assisted, if need be, by the Council of Agriculture of the quarter, shall forthwith employ himself in amicably terminating the differences, as far as they may be within his province.

"82. In cases where the differences are of a nature not to be decided by the officer of Rural Police, assisted by the Council of Agriculture, he shall call upon the parties to

choose arbiters, within the section, to settle and decide their differences.

"83. In cases where the differences cannot thus be settled by arbitration on the spot, or when the parties shall not have named arbiters, the officer of Rural Police shall wait till Saturday or Sunday in order to send the parties before the Justice of Peace of the commune. The whole must be concluded in the space of six days at most.

84. The Justice of Peace shall be bound to decide the difference, and shall not be at liberty, under pain of being punished for a denial of justice, to allege the silence of the law on the cause brought before him for his decision.

"85. The Justice of Peace shall be bound to pronounce within twenty-four hours, at the utmost, after the appearance of the parties."

The fourth law regards the establishment and regulation of farms for breeding cattle, and the contracts between the proprietors or renters, and laborers on the same.

The fifth law regards the care and management of the animals, and the damage they may do in the fields, and is characterized by justice and sound sense.

The sixth law establishes and regulates the Rural Police. Hayti is divided into departments. The departments are subdivided into communes; and these again into rural sections. The military commandant of each department is responsible for the decay of agriculture and the execution of the Code Rural within his department. The commandant of each commune is responsible for his commune; and the officer of rural police in each section is responsible for his section. These officers are to make regular inspections and accurate returns of the population and the state of agriculture. The rural section is limited to about four square leagues in the plains, and in the mountains, according to the nature of the ground. Each officer of such a section has under his command *three* rural guards. Thus there is *one* military man to every square league. The same law establishes in every commune a Council of Agriculture for certain specified purposes. The object of the Rural Police is stated to be, 1. To repress vagrancy. 2. To maintain order and assiduity in the labors of the field. 3. The discipline of the laboring population. 4. The making and repairing public and private roads. It was in this portion of

the Code Rural that the West India slaveholders found the articles at which they were so much horror stricken, and which their American copyists profess to believe so much worse than the American slave code. Yet they have found nothing of *whips*, or *chains* or irresponsible masters. The whole amount of the *coercion*, which figures so largely in their comments, is, that persons who have no other visible means of living, *must work* on the farms under proprietors of their own choice, or on the roads under the rural police. They must not leave the plantation without permission. The slavery advocates would have us infer from the articles which they do extract, that by others which they do not extract the laborers are subject to a discipline similar to that of slavery. Yet the only article on the subject, and which they were careful to omit, is this: "189. Every act of disobedience or insult, on the part of a workman commanded to do any work *which he has engaged to do by a reciprocal contract or agreement*, shall be punished by *imprisonment*, according to the exigency of the case, and *according to the decision of the Justice of Peace of the commune*." The remainder of the code is occupied with detailed regulations in regard to the making and repairing of the roads.

This code passed the Chamber of Commons, at Port au Prince, on the 21st of April, 1826, it passed the Senate on the 4th, and received the signature of President Boyer on the 6th of the succeeding May. It is said to have been the work of Secretary-General Inginac, assisted by a committee of the legislature. After this review, exceedingly brief compared with the code itself, we feel no fear that the reader will disagree with us, when we pronounce it a perfect contrast to the American Slave code. The most literally rigid execution of the Code Rural could by no possibility produce any thing like the misery which is the daily and inevitable consequence of the American system of coercion.

But does it not show that emancipated slaves will not work without compulsion—that they will not work for mere wages? Certainly not. The whole code is built on the supposition that they *will* work for wages. Its coercive power is well adapted to correct individual cases of idleness or vagrancy which might be expected to abound among such a population as that of Hayti, so released from the

yoke, but it would be utterly impotent to secure the industry of a people generally averse to labor. Who are the agents charged with the enforcement of the so called coercion? They are chiefly persons chosen by the laborers themselves and chosen from among themselves. The very conducteurs, or, as the slaveholders insist upon translating it, the *drivers*, are chosen by the laborers whom they are to conduct. The whole code is the work of a legislature chosen by the people, the majority of whom are the laborers themselves. If then it is a case of coercion, it is a case where the people coerce themselves. Alas! what idle wretches the people of Hayti must be—they have to *force* themselves to labor!

The Code Rural of Hayti, so far as coercion is concerned, is certainly not, as our learned editors have affirmed, "without example in any nation." The British law is remarkably parallel, and the advocates of slavery might as well infer from that, that the British yeomanry are "in a condition little different from that of slaves." Says Sir William Blackstone, in his "Commentaries on the Laws of England," "All single men between twelve years old and sixty, and married ones under thirty years of age, and all single women between twelve and forty, not having any visible livelihood, are *compellable* by two justices, to go out to service in husbandry, or certain specific trades for the promotion of honest industry." Again, "A third species of servants are laborers, who are only hired by the day or the week, and do not live *intra mœnia*, as part of the family; concerning whom the statutes before cited, (5 Eliz. c. 4. and 6 Geo. III. c. 26,) have made many very good regulations: 1. Directing that all persons who have no visible effects *may be compelled to work*. 2. Defining *how long* they must continue to work in summer and in winter: 3. PUNISHING such as *leave or desert* their work: 4. Empowering the *Justices at Sessions*, or the *Sheriff* of the county *to settle their wages*: 5. Inflicting penalties upon such as either give or exact more wages than are so settled." Book I. p. 427.

We are inclined to think that the Code Rural is no exception to the general truth that legislators are prone to legislate too much, but it exhibits a wise adaptation of means to ends, and a provision for contingencies which could have resulted only from great experience or marvellous penetra-

tion. It does infinite credit to Hayti. What nation, not advanced to the summit of civilization, has produced a code more justly and philosophically adapted to the purposes for which it was framed. To those who are clamorous after a "plan by which slavery can be abolished without producing greater evils," we commend the Code Rural of Hayti, with all its "horrors." If American slaveholders will adopt that, we will cease our interference with their coercion to-morrow.

IV. THE HORRORS OF IDLENESS.

Says James Franklin, "I shall be able to show that Hayti presents no instance in which the cultivation of the soil is successfully carried on without the application of force to constrain the laborer." p. 7. Again, "I declare it to be my firm conviction, that unless coercion be resorted to, the negro will not labor. 'The impulse for indulging in sloth and indolence is too irresistible, and it will not be in the power of the government to make any progress in agricultural labor, except it be done by actual force.'" p. 343. And again, "It is perhaps unfortunate that the local authorities in Hayti are individuals without decision, *and too apt to submit to the will of the people*; mere nonentities, without resolution sufficient to command obedience in their several districts, although invested with power to commit, or inflict summary punishment. Hence there is much reason to presume that the enactments of the Code Rural will become inefficacious for a more general and extensive cultivation of the soil, and that agricultural pursuits will be not the least encouraged or promoted by its clauses, because the task of enforcing them devolves on the very imbecile class of persons who constitute the executive part of the government." p. 363. So it seems that the coercion that has made such a terrible figure in the "horrors of the Code Rural," is only *potential*, not actual. The charge now is that of Pharaoh against the Israelites—"Ye are idle, ye are idle." And this idleness, too, is the result of emancipation! for says our author in this connection, "It is indisputable that the *declaration of freedom* to the slave population of Hayti was the ruin of the country." It is consoling however to learn from the same candid and philosophical traveler, that this ruin does not involve the *starvation* of the people, nor is it

conclusive against the practicability of labor for wages in the United States, he says, "there cannot be a greater distinction between two classes of people than there is between the free laborers in Hayti and those of Cuba and the Southern States of North America. * * * In the United States the incitements to labor are great, the most important being that of want; and until the Haytians are impelled by a stimulus equally powerful, they will not work; and that such a stimulus will be found is not probable, *while we know that the labor of a few days will furnish a negro with sustenance for a month.*"

Fortified by such consolation, we are prepared to encounter with tolerable composure the grievous jeremiads of our American editors. Alas! they exclaim, "from the day of their emancipation to the present, the population for the most part, has been idle and worthless." "St. Domingo was the garden of the new world—the richest of the Indies. But its villas have gone to ruin, and its fields run to waste. Thorns and briars have clothed their gardens, and the plantations have been barren from idleness."* Yes, those delectable old villas, where 30,000 white nabobs reveled in luxury at the expense of 450,000 black laborers in the fields, *have* gone to ruin, and we shall presently see wherefore; but for the honor of freedom and republicanism, we might add, if we could *believe* this editor, that the *idleness* which has produced those naughty "thorns and briars" has occurred under a government that "has ever been *despotic.*" We have always believed in the impotency of despotism to produce industry. But unfortunately the sagacious proslavery traveler, above quoted, spoils both the *despotism* and the *idleness*. He says, "The system pursued by the Haytian government respecting the disposal of its lands seems to be erroneous. Allotting it out in small grants of ten or fifteen acres,† is an injudicious measure; it only tends towards extending and perpetuating the evil and pernicious habits of the people. When a negro obtains a grant of a small tract of land, he cares little about the cultivation of it beyond the production of enough for his own immediate wants, and those wants are trifling. Two or three hours labor in each week will suffice to answer all the purposes of

* New-York Commercial Advertiser, September 24, 1834.

† Five *carreaux*, or *fifteen* acres is the smallest grant that can be made.

culture required to produce food enough for himself.—* * * Such being the case, and known to be so by the government, it is enough to surprise one that they should parcel out their lands in this way, because, even under the Code Rural, the person holding it, is no longer a laborer but a proprietor, and *is not therefore amenable to it*. Had the government proceeded differently, and let the estates to farm as they were originally laid out, so many petty proprietors would not have existed, but would have remained amenable to the law for enforcing cultivation. From this unwise system laborers are *scarce* in Hayti, and the few that are to be obtained are the worst of characters, negroes so abandoned as not to have been considered worthy of inheriting a patch of land. Hayti abounds with these small proprietors; their patches of land, with their huts upon them, are generally situate in the mountains, in the recesses, or on the most elevated parts, on spots, as the poet has described them, 'the most inaccessible by shepherds trod.*' They are therefore lost for the purposes of agriculture; their cultivation does not extend beyond vegetables for the market in their vicinity, added to which they furnish an occasional supply of pork, poultry, and wild pigeons." p. 343. A most amiable "despotism" this of Hayti, after all! Even the coercion of its Code Rural, such as it is, extends only to laborers of the "worst characters." *The rest are all made PROPRIETORS, by small grants of land from the government*,—an admirable plan one would think, to encourage good order and industry. But we learn from Mr. Franklin that by this "injudicious measure" the people "are lost for the purposes of agriculture," being rendered so idle as only to supply their own wants and "the markets in their vicinity"! The lamentable indolence of the Haytians, therefore turns out to be a mere preference to labor moderately for themselves on their own freeholds, instead of being worked to skeletons in the boiling houses and distilleries of large sugar estates, chiefly for the benefit of the proprietors thereof. Such indolence is truly censurable by us, in a country where "the pursuit of happiness" is not considered an "inalienable right," but a "rhetorical flourish"!

Thus have we seen from one of the most venal and thor-

* Ah, indeed! were the estates "originally laid out" in the *mountains*? If not, what a *loss* to Hayti, to have its wild mountains cultivated by hardy freemen!

oughly trained witnesses of the pro-slavery party, that the Haytians live happily under laws that respect the rights and liberty of all. No matter what has become of the exports, the people are free and happy under a government which "submits to their will" and is the servant of their interests. This is conclusive of all that we need establish ; but this is not the end of the argument. Franklin has developed means and measures, on the part of the government, which he and his party may sneer at as much as they please, but which every wise man will perceive to be wisely adapted to produce the best results on the character and condition of the people. These results Franklin himself is not able altogether to conceal, as he goes through the island weeping and wailing over the dilapidated villas and ruined carriage-roads of the old planters, and turning up his aristocratic nose at the "little patches" of their ci-devant slaves. To give the reader a full view of what we refer to, we must bring forward a witness from the other side,—a traveler who visited Hayti in 1830 at the expense of the London Anti-Slavery Society, extracts from whose journal are to be found in the Anti-Slavery Reporters for March and April, 1831. If it be objected that this witness is as much a *paid* one as the other, the reader will still have the satisfaction to perceive that at least in the matter of self-consistency, and consistency with the laws of human nature, as well as in good English, the Anti-Slavery Society made by far the better bargain.

Says this traveler, writing from Port au Prince, "The market on Saturday, which extends over to Sunday morning, presents an assemblage of people who have no affinity with the laboring population of the slave colonies, but that which they derive from their common African origin. There is the black skin and the woolly hair, but there is an elevation of character in the features, which indicates the working of better motives than fear and submission."

"Some writers have affirmed that the untractable idleness of the Haytians has led them to consult their ease in all things. If this be so, we cannot but admire the operation of the motive in the preservation of that robust health and vigor, which it seems to secure to parent and child, through the diminished toil they enjoy, and by means of the possession of numerous well trained and strong-limbed asses and horses

on which they are seen riding to market, and bringing down a prodigious quantity of agricultural products for sale. The excellent training of the ass, called here the *bourrique*, excites no less admiration than his large size, and the sleek and glossy condition of his make. As his great utility secures him from ill treatment, he is neither slow, stupid, nor headstrong. Teams of from three to six tied together trot on unstimulated by word or blow from the owner, who rides on one animal, with perhaps his wife on a second, and his lusty and helpful boy on another. The herds of these animals must be immense."

"I shall not here descant upon the fact so well known, that an article of the constitution declared that, '*au premier coup de canon d'alarme, les villes disparaîtront, et la nation se levèra*;'* but it is clear that this circumstance alone must have been sufficient to influence the small proprietors in fixing their locations, even so near the city and seat of government, in the mountains, rather than in the plains, fertile as they are."

"The cultivation of the range of mountains from Point Lamentin to the valley of the Cul de Sac, on the South side of Port au Prince, is, at this time much more extensive than it ever was in the period of its colonial history. The *plains* were the source of such abundant profit for the industry of the proprietor, that the mountains in the neighborhood were comparatively neglected. At present they are covered with a thousand small settlements, appropriated to coffee and provisions, and fruits and vegetables, in which all have secured for their fields the advantages of *irrigation*, under the surveillance of a *rural police*, which regulates diligently the arrangement and proper keeping of these important water courses. On the very spot where Christophe, as recently as in the time of the nascent republic of Petion, after clearing away brushwood and forest trees planted his batteries, and unsuccessfully invested the city, the cottage of the humble cultivator is seen, or the substantial country seat of the Haytian merchant has been erected. All these are new plantations."

"I will just briefly notice that the planters here concentrate their agriculture in little space. They take off a crop

* At the first report of the alarm gun, the cities shall disappear, and the nation shall rise in arms. Constitution of Dessalines 1805.

of corn between their canes, and plant peas, potatoes (not the pomme de terre, but the true patata of the Indians,) and maize on the same field. They gather their peas before their potatoes are fit, and dig the potatoes before the corn ripens and shells its grain—so that much is effected in very little compass. Food of all kinds, animal and vegetable, is four times cheaper here than in Jamaica."

"The patches of cornfields which spot the forests of the mountains, the thick groves of the bananas which line the hollows of the steeps, and the shrubby breaks of coffee trees which here and there diversify the luxuriant vegetation of hill and valley, are the agricultural wealth that conceal the domestic haunts of the Haytian husbandmen.—It is only when the traveller opens some angle of the ravines, that he sees the cottage itself, situated upon some small plateau within the hollow, and commanding its own stream of clear and limpid waters trenched along the upland surface of its own little quiet property for the purposes of fertility or refreshment."

"Before unsaddling our horses, with the intention of resting for the night at Moquet, we had seized the opportunity, while yet there was an hour of departing sunshine, to ride out and view the cultivation of the adjacent estates eastward. Well-trimmed hedge rows lined the public road on which we traveled, and I heard with interest, that these were the enclosures of some small sugar farms, the subdivisions of a concessionary grant to a military person, whose family had now parcelled the inheritance in little properties. They had their separate cottages sheltered by the luxuriant foliage of the shrubs and trees that administer food and refreshment in the tropics. They depended on the mills of their wealthier neighbors for the means of converting the crop into a commodity for sale, and in that dependance tilled their little fields, with a sure reckoning of their sugar proceeds, beside what they reaped in the shape of corn, yams, patatas, manioc, grass and green vegetables for the weekly market."

"The Haytians very justly observe, that whatever questions may be raised as to whether their life is one of well directed industry, or of carelessness, sloth, and ease, they can point to the fact that there is impressed on the people the habit of good manners, and of attention to their person-

al appearance, as a striking circumstance within the reach of the most superficial inquirers."

"Between the Bahamas and north coast of Hayti, there is a great trade recently opened, by a proclamation of Sir G. Murray's, the prohibition of the act not extending to these islands; and no injury has occurred to the morals and political feeling of the slaves of the Bahamas, who come and go freely, for they find that Hayti is not a country in which the people live without labor."

"We arrived in Port au Prince by eight o'clock in the morning, passing through a numerous train of country people, composed of old and young, aged persons, youths, maidens, and children, all speeding away on their loaded horses and asses, to the Saturday market. Some had come down from as far as Mirebalais, a distance of fifty miles, to sell and buy for their household wants."

"Port au Prince, though by no means a handsome town, is, at this day, in style and one may say in splendor, far superior to what it was in the colonial period of its history *** One third of the city, eight years ago, fell by the destructive element. Industry has in a great measure repaired this calamity, but the marks are not entirely obliterated. **** The city of Port au Prince covers a large space of ground. It is certainly nearly, if not quite as large as Kingston, in Jamaica; being a full mile in extent, from the portal of St. Joseph to the barrier of Leogane; but it is not estimated to contain more than from twenty to 25,000 inhabitants, whereas Kingston contains from thirty to 40,000, a slave community permitting the free to have about them many attendants, so that each house is more numerously tenanted.

"The city of the Cape is indeed nothing but the shell of its ancient grandeur; but even here, where restoration promises the least, the eye is cheered by the sight of workmen engaged in rebuilding, in an equally showy and substantial style, some of the ancient private edifices. *** Individual enterprise is doing its best to restore the ruined dwellings to a habitable condition, and the roofless walls, that pretty plentifully intersperse the city, standing out like ragged beggars amid well-dressed company, as if their decayed gentility had entitled them to be tolerated, are daily diminishing in number."

This traveler bears uniform testimony to the industry and enterprise of the cultivators, and independent farmers throughout the country at the same time that he admits the indolence of a certain portion of the people of the towns—a class that exists in every country and is always greatly enlarged by military operations. He also states the results of his very careful and particular inquiry into the actual working of the Code Rural; and they correspond satisfactorily with what any sensible and unprejudiced person would expect from the code itself. As a fair example of the larger estates cultivated according to the regulations of that code, we gave at some length our traveler's minute and graphic description* of Chateau Blond, the estate of General Lerebour, the commandant of Port au Prince.

"We entered a straight, wide roadway of the plantation, having the refreshing verdure of the canefields, and the dome and turret of the sugar mills before us, and leaving on the left hand as we passed a small group of cottages, the dwellings of the cultivators. They stood towards the open fields, sheltered only by the vegetation of the banana, and though spacious were neither uniform nor particularly neat. An aged man repairing the gateway, and one or two fine featured, healthy bodied, cheerful, well dressed negresses, who accosted us with courtesy and passed on, and a couple of little children playing in the dust, were the only inhabitants that we met. The fields extended themselves far away to the right and were covered with canes of considerable bulk. Here and there gardens of the cultivators containing the patata and yam, the maize and the manioc, were intermingled with the sugar canes forming occasional patches planted with great order and regularity. The Bell-come mountain lowered before us clothed in the rich verdure and diversified with the variety of aspects which the broken cultivation of its many small detached settlements gave to it. The barren cliffs forming the gorge of the valley, through which the Grande Rivière descended, formed a remarkable feature in the distant landscape. Hills of steep ascent and of vast altitude rose to the clouds, dark, shadowy

* The reader will understand that the irrepressible luxuriance of this traveler's style, like that of the tropical vegetation, is the natural consequence of his being born under a more ardent sun than ours. We suppose him to be a native of Jamaica. But his journal is replete with evidence that he depended upon his senses, and not upon his theories, for his facts.

and hazy, forming a back ground to the tilled fields in which the dark leaved abricot and the plumes of the palma nobilis in the gardens of Chateau Blond, seemed almost the only trees that relieved the transition from the plains to the mountains.

"The proprietor's residence, and the mills, and boiling house, with the aqueduct, a canal of wood, supported on columns of mason work, form altogether a quadrangle enclosing the workshops of the estate, such as the smithy and place for the mill-wright. On the left hand of the enclosure is the polygonal dome erected over a steam sugar mill of eight horse power, turning horizontal rollers; while to the right stands a water mill with vertical ones; between them is the boiling house with a turret in the centre. The whole of these buildings are of mason work, and constructed not merely substantially but elegantly. The aqueduct on one side, and a balustrade stone fence on the other, shuts in the quadrangle. Within this space may be said to be the sugar works. The proprietor's residence, a neat cottage edifice erected on a platform of terrace work, with many a flowery shrub around it, and with the usual accompaniment of the embowered bath formed of the close coup d' air (a species of convolvulus), clustering with its lilac tinted silver blossoms, overlooked the whole economy of the mill-yard. The whole estate contains ninety carreaus of land, about two hundred acres, the principal portion of which are planted in canes, the rest in provisions. About two hundred men, women and children in all, are located upon it.

"The island of Jamaica does not exhibit a plantation better established than Chateau Blond: whether we consider the resources of the land, or the mechanical economy by which those resources are commanded, it is a splendid establishment.

"Every thing is new,—the mills, the boiling house, the aqueducts, the cottage residence, all are the production of a few years of slow but constant labor, unassisted by any pecuniary loan, and unincumbered by a mortgage. In the difficulty of obtaining a number of laborers to get in the crop of an estate, the proprietor of Chateau Blond has decided that it will be judicious to accelerate the speed of the boiling house, by increasing the products of the mill. With this view he has availed himself on either hand of

water and steam machinery, it being easier to boil quick, so as to check fermentation, than to grind quick, so as to give full occupation to the boilers. As these mills do their work simultaneously, the souring of the canes by accumulation is avoided.

"The machinery of this estate, erected at very considerable expense, is designed not merely for the supply of its own wants in the elaboration of sugar, but for those of the neighboring plantations which may be without the means of manufacturing that article. The mulcture, to use an old feudal term, paid to the proprietor of the mill is one-fourth of the inspissated juice when boiled into the syrup of the third copper. The law limits him to one-fifth in his contracts with his cultivator, but with any other class of persons he is at liberty to bargain as he can. In the fore part of the week during crop time they cut their canes, and grind them off when a sufficiency is accumulated. The laborers, men and women, in the mill and the boiling house, perform their work occasionally by night as well as by day. Their scheme of cultivation is to allot themselves by families, and to cultivate unitedly one division of the estate, receiving the reward of their labor in a portion of what they cultivate and manufacture in their division, according to the prescriptions of the Code Rural. It frequently occurs that the number of persons, thus associated, are not able to proceed with sufficient celerity in the work of grinding and boiling the proceeds of the number of acres under their management and tillage, in such case the gangs are obliged to hire help from their neighbors, or from other gangs who have no part in their allotment. In this way the work is conducted in Chateau Blond. There is in this arrangement, which has originated out of views of interest and convenience in the cultivators themselves, so much of calculation individually made, so much of contract mutually entered into, that it would be the highest absurdity to suppose that such men underwent any thing in the nature of labor *stimulated by any other compulsion than that of the advantage they reap from it*. I record this declaration as a sentiment expressed to me by one of the managing cultivators, who communicated answers to my questions, and conducted me over the property. They select their *conducteurs* as an association would their chairman, or a benefit club their secretary

and treasurer, not to drive them unwillingly to labor, but as one deputed to manage their collective interest in their bargain with the proprietor of the soil. As I had expressed a desire to see something of the domestic habits of the people and of the economy observed in their houses, the friend who accompanied me to Chateau Blond walked with me under the heat of the mid-day sun among the plantation cottages. They are so habitually civil and polite in this country that the intrusion of a stranger on such an errand as a mere visit of curiosity would have been readily excused, but we were spared the necessity of soliciting any indulgence by a negress who sat at the door of her dwelling requesting us to retire from the sunshine into the coolness and shelter which her cottage would afford us. We found three females of her family diligently engaged in their task of needle work. Beyond the courtesy of a salutation as we entered and seated ourselves in the chairs set out for us, neither curiosity at our visit nor idle attention to our conversation drew them from their employment. The house was built with a common sitting-room in the centre, and two bed-rooms at each end. The furniture, besides chairs, consisted of a table on which were articles of earthen ware, and shelves on which were other household utensils. The saddlery of their borriques was hung against the wall towards the entrance of one of the bed-rooms, a mat and goat's skin were spread upon the floor, upon which the infant of one of the daughters was sleeping. A compliment to the healthy lustiness of the child, (and it was one which it justly merited,) brought us by a natural transition to the question of the number of the family. The father was seated beside us,—but as we were anxious not to run the risk of false facts respecting population by receiving the accounts of the offspring of the men which might be by more women than one, we directed our inquiries to the mother. We found that these cottagers were then about forty or forty-five years old, that they were the parents of thirteen children, eleven of whom were living, that seven were daughters, three of whom were married, and the mothers of five children in all; that their husbands were at their avocations in the field, as were also the male portion of the family, but that the plump fine limbed little girls whom we saw coming in and out of the cottage were the

younger part of the children. While we were seated here the plantation bell sounded the summons of two o'clock, the signal for such as had occupation to resume it. Instantly we heard the carpenters' hammers and masons' trowels renew the sound of labor, and every one without any altercation or a murmur were again busy at their appointed toil."

We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of giving yet a few more extracts from this sunshiny traveler. Surely the reader will not soon tire of the vindication of a people so vilely slandered by a slaveholding aristocracy. Of another plantation called Dumornay-Bellevue, our traveler says, "The rich depth of the stoneless soil—the fresh verdure of its productions—its systematic tillage and irrigation—gave an appearance of great order and care to the agriculture of the peasantry. In the fields we found a parcel of men and boys at work, cutting canes for the mill, under the direction of the conducteur. They were not drilled in lines, but were working indiscriminately, and singing like merry reapers at a European harvest.

"After making our inspection, the last gleam of sunny radiance along the green surface of the level plains warned us to Moquet for the night. Visiting, however, before we quitted the estate, the cottage of the conducteur or foreman we had seen in the fields, we had an opportunity of remarking the domestic condition of another family. Three of the sons, mere-boys, had returned from their day's labor, with baskets of provisions from the garden, and bundles of herbage for the asses and stied hogs about the cottage. The wife had been engaged all day, at the door of her dwelling, in ironing up the linen of the family, which she was then carrying within the house. Every thing had the appearance of substantial comfort, and, if we wanted an evidence of its accompanying wealth, we had it in the alacrity with which our cottager drew from a bag of money forty dollars, for a purchase effected for him by the friend who had made this visit with me. I found upon inquiry that he too was the father of thirteen children, all alive, five of whom were then before us."

The following description would fairly place its subject by the side of old Cincinnatus, were it not for the ugly stain which it pleased his Maker to give to his *rete mucosum*. It may very safely be questioned whether in the height of

their prosperity the old white planters could have furnished one man to match the industry and talent of this negro senator ; and yet we Americans are bewailing the blight of ignorance, idleness and worthlessness that has befallen St. Domingo !

"Aug. 6. By day-break we proceeded to quit Moquet, on our journey to Dignerou, the plantation of the treasurer-general, Mr. Nau. M. Lacombe, and his party of friends, being on an intended visit to the French Consul, at his cottage in the mountains of La Coupe, and our road lying partly the same way, we set out together, a large cavalcade of travelers, and surprised Monsieur Senator L' Espinasse, nearly in the humble checked camisette of a cultivator, busily engaged in the work of his sugar refining and sugar distillery. It was a superb manufactory, erected on a concessionary grant of ten carreaux, partitioned out of the ancient estate of Moquet ; a grant he had earned by services to his country. His own plantation of Soissons adjoined to the northward. The refinery is built just where the low range of hills, at the foot of La Coupe, merge into the plains. There the sterile uplands cease and the fertile lowlands commence. Monsieur L' Espinasse himself conducted us over the whole establishment. He exhibited both in his manners and his words an enthusiasm for the commercial and agricultural progress of his country, which showed that his own success in drawing forth its resources, under great obstacles, was less a circumstance of gratification for its individual good, than for its general influence on the spirit and enterprise of the population. He was a remarkable man possessed of that kind of energy of character, which fittest him for great enterprises in a young and aspiring country. It was by the elasticity of a disposition, unchecked by reverses, that he was enabled, through great toil, to bring his manufactory to its present state of maturity and profit. The sugar with which his refinery is supplied is entirely drawn from his adjoining estate. The establishment is very large. On the respective floors of the building we saw the process of claying the new or muscovado sugar, and that of refining it, and forming it into the lump sugar of commerce. We observed some loaves, whose whiteness, dryness, and transparency, and smallness of grain, showed the matured perfection of his process—an art which he

boasts to have acquired in a country where almost the simplest elements of sugar making had been lost in the anarchy of the revolution, without any insight into that of other countries."

Of Dignerón, the traveler says, "This estate comprises three-fourths of the original plantation, esteemed of old one of the largest in the Cul de Sac, and reputed at this time to be one of the best tilled in this district. There are about fifty families, or two hundred persons, young and old, as cultivators upon it. Its annual proceeds are 150,000 pounds weight of sugar, and 50,000 of syrup. In 1817 and 1818, it netted about 230,000 pounds of sugar with a proportionate quantity of syrup and taffia; but the proprietor from the very indifferent price of the commodity in the market, chooses rather to diminish its returns than to extend them: one hundred and eighty acres are in canes."

This ought to satisfy even the most thorough going advocates of slavery, for in proportion to the number of laborers, it equals, the returns in the best of the British sugar colonies. See Report of the Lords' Committee, p. 837.

We shall take leave of our traveler, by quoting his gratifying testimony in regard to the preference given in Hayti to agriculture over the idleness of the camp. We have already seen that the Code Rural makes provision for the employment of soldiers in cultivation. Our traveler remarks, "That every village in Hayti may be said to be garrisoned, at least every small township or bourgade is a military post, under the command of a colonel or captain commandant, with a suitable guard, who, besides regulating all matters connected with the order, appointments and duty of the soldiery, assists the civil authority in the execution of justice. Nothing but the dress, the small sword (briquet), and the body accoutrements of the soldier are in his own custody. His arms are deposited in the guard-room of his captain, from whence they are taken at the times of the periodical musters, the rendezvous of each company being the captain's house. It is only a portion of the regiment that is on constant duty. As the residence of every captain is a sort of arsenal, a guard appointed from his company performs duty there, as at a cazerne or barrack, for a week. The whole company being subdivided into guards, and each taking his turn of periodical duty, it seems that there are long inter-

vals when the men are relieved from the exactions of military life. In these intervals, they are employed in handicraft labor, or in the cultivation of the land, and assume generally the habits of the people—the 'jaquet' of the artisan, or the 'varais' of the cultivator. By this arrangement, their utility as citizens is increased, but their spirit and discipline, as an effective military body, materially neutralized. Their pay and allowance not being as much as the earnings of a day laborer, many of those who think time of value, and the happiness of life something better than the luxury of repose, when their time of weekly guard occurs, are indulged with the permission to pursue undisturbedly their avocations, by paying for a substitute, under special arrangement with the captain."

If, after all, it be objected that this testimony is anonymous, let the reader remember that by appearing in the "Anti-Slavery Reporter," as *authentic*, it has, in effect, become the testimony of Zachary Macaulay, of Thomas Fowell Buxton, of Wilberforce—men whose facts were never questioned with impunity.

The beauty of this testimony, as we have already hinted, is that it is consistent with itself as well as with human nature; while that of the maligners of the Haytians is irreconcilably at war with itself and with all mankind. Franklin, in the same breath that he says, "The free laborer in Hayti, from innate indolence, and from his state of ignorance, obtains barely enough for his subsistence," admits that the exports in 1825, one of the least prosperous years of Boyer's administration, amounted to the value of \$8,000,000—more than \$8 to every man, woman and child in Hayti! He will have it, that because the freeholders of Hayti do not work themselves and their children to the bone, to equal the exports under the old regime of slavery, they are fast sinking "to a level with the brutes."* But why should they export more? Do we suppose the wants natural or artificial, of the present population of Hayti, are the same as those of the old French planters? Do they de-siderate the costly luxuries of Paris and London, of which they know neither the use nor the name? Not at all. Hence the difference in the agriculture and exports. The

* Present state of Hayti, p. 329, 360.

old planter wanted silks, mirrors, paintings, jewelry, porcelain and plate, or he wanted money to live like a prince in Paris, accordingly he flogged and half starved a hundred slaves to export 200 hogsheads of sugar. But the present Haytian freeman wants food for his "*thirteen children*," and besides that, he wants handkerchiefs and calico frocks for his wife and daughters, and a decent coat for himself, and to supply these wants he cultivates his patch with moderate labor; the fertile soil yields him all the food that could be asked, and for his foreign comforts he exports one hundred dollars worth of his coffee, keeping his sugar to sweeten his own cup. The Haytians now exercise their "inalienable right" to pursue their own happiness. They live for their own comfort. Says Mr. Robert Sutherland, in his examination before a select committee of the House of Commons, 1832, "I have seen the peasantry in the Highlands of Scotland where I was brought up, and I declare that the negroes in St. Domingo are comparatively as much superior to them in comfort, as it is possible for one man to be over another." Admiral Fleming testified before the same committee, that the Haytians appeared to him "the happiest, best fed, and most comfortable negroes he had ever seen: better off than in Caraccas: infinitely better than in Jamaica: there was no comparison between them." Again, "their victuals were very superior to those in Jamaica, consisting chiefly of meat; cattle being very cheap. The highest contract beef in Hayti, was 2*d.*, in Jamaica it was 12*d.** *He saw no marks of destitution any where.* The country seemed improving and trade increasing. A road had been cut from Port au Prince to Cape Haytien, that would do honor to any country. A regular post was established. The government was one quite worthy of a civilized people. He rode about very much, and every where saw the people *working in the fields.*"

So much for the "horrors of idleness." Here is a nation rising from the mire of the streets, where for ages her people had been trampled under the feet of tyrants, shunned, hated, frowned upon and slandered by all the so called civilized nations of the earth; she moves forward, and al-

* As Hayti is hardly out of sight of Jamaica, it may be wondered why the latter did not import provisions from the former. The explanation is, that the slaveholders of Jamaica were afraid the Haytian beef, being infected with liberty, might spoil their slaves! So they had the commerce prohibited.

ready rivals the highest and best, in the security of property, the abundance of provisions, the peace, good order and happiness of her citizens. So far from deserving the foul reproaches of her enemies, Hayti stands forth a monument of strenuous and well directed enterprise, honorable alike to herself and to human nature. In the race of civilization, as we shall presently see, she may justly boast like the old Greek worthy, who not only outstripped his competitors, but did it with a four-year-old bull on his shoulders. We are now prepared to attend to

V. THE HORRORS OF DESOLATION.

We have by no means finished the lesson of St. Domingo, when we have shown that neither emancipation, nor the Code Rural, nor the character of the emancipated, is responsible for any of its troubles. That island is the theatre on which slavery has worked out its tendencies to their full development; first, grinding in the dust half a million of people, at an enormous sacrifice of human life, and next, after this people, driven by oppression to revolt, had established their liberty on the basis of constitutional law, waging against them a brutal and murderous war. What if it had been true, that the doctrine of emancipation caused the horrors of the first insurrection? Did it cause the far more desolating crusade against liberty? It is to be doubted whether this tyrant-ridden world ever saw a meaner, more perfidious, or more hellishly cruel attack upon any nation than that of the French in 1802 upon the free people of St. Domingo. If that invasion had not met with a fate most signally disastrous, it would almost have amounted to a proof that Divine Providence had abandoned the earth to the author of evil.

The system of labor which could instigate such a war ought, for that one act, to be condemned by every friend of his race to everlasting execration and its utter abolition made the object of his unceasing endeavors. Had we known nothing of slavery but what has been taught us by the campaigns of Le Clerc and Rochambeau, upon that knowledge alone would we have vowed eternal enmity to the principle of **PROPERTY IN MAN**—a war never to be pacified in practice, while a slave shall tread the universe of God, nor in theory, while God continues to have a universe. We

have seen the condition of St. Domingo under the noble Toussaint, the perfect security of property to the planters, the industry of its people, the almost miraculous resuscitation of its ancient splendor,—truly the light was breaking forth as the morning. Long prior to the time (1796) when Toussaint was invested with the supreme command in St. Domingo, by the French government, he had in fact conducted the defence of the colony against the British arms. He rescued it. He reduced its jarring elements to harmony. He gave it a well digested constitution, and in so doing not only acted in accordance with the constitution of France, but expressly declared his allegiance to that power.* And he might well boast that this instrument accomplished what was promised in its preamble,—it substituted "abundance for want; peace and industry for civil war and vagrancy, and security for terror."

Yet at this crisis it was that SLAVERY stirred up the throne-builder of Europe to reinstate *her* in her old dominion. No thanks to the slaveholders that Bonaparte had his own ends to accomplish as well as theirs. They swarmed at his levees, and urged him to the conquest. "I must get rid of sixty thousand men," said Bonaparte to his minister Forfait, and this necessary preparation for the assumption of the imperial crown doubtless helped his decision. When the new constitution of the colony, which guarantied liberty to all and appointed Toussaint governor for life, was brought to France for the approbation of the mother country, Bonaparte replied to its bearer, Vincent, "That rebel slave must be punished; the honor of France has been outraged."

The first expedition under Bonaparte's brother-in-law, Le Clerc, consisting of thirty thousand of the veterans of Italy and Egypt, and a host of the old planters, eager to make up for lost time in using their favorite instrument upon the backs of the "rebels," descended upon St. Domingo at

* The anonymous History of St. Domingo "printed in London, 1818" asserts that a proclamation of independence "was made in due form on the first of July 1801," but we find no other authority to that effect. The constitution itself was styled, "*de la Colonie Française de St. Domingue*." And its "*Discours Préliminaire*" as given by Mackenzie, in stating its object, says—"et enfin la soumettre toute entière à l'empire Français." If there had been any declaration of independence, it is not easy to see why Bonaparte failed to make *that* the pretext of his invasion. Mackenzie's Notes on Hayti. Vol. II. p. 259.

three points almost simultaneously about the 2d of February, 1802. The first act of hostility was the massacre of a large body of defenceless and unresisting people at the Bay of Mancenille, by Rochambeau. Christophe who had charge of Cape François, set fire first to his own house, and left the city in ashes. Finding Toussaint well aware of his designs, and not ill prepared to frustrate them, Le Clerc betook himself to deceptive proclamations, and all manner of perfidy. By these means, rather than arms, he brought Toussaint to agree to a peace in which *LIBERTY was solemnly guarantied to all*. The next step was to seize the negro chief and send him to freeze and starve in the dungeons of France. [See the cover of this No.] Then it was that Le Clerc proceeded to gratify the planters by reestablishing slavery and the slave trade. Vengeance met him at the threshold. The cane fields and the sugar houses were in flames. Hardly any thing was left that a torch could set fire to. Pestilence swept away the thirty thousand veterans and Le Clerc soon followed them to his long home, Rochambeau succeeded to the chief command, his army being recruited from time to time by fresh victims from France. He was the school-master of Dessalines in the art of human butchery, and by how much France excelled St. Domingo in arts and sciences, by so much did Rochambeau exceed the perfidies and barbarities which have rendered the name of the negro chief so frightful. To recount a tithe of his atrocities would exceed our limits. He filled the land with scaffolds and gibbets, and corpses tainting the breeze; he burnt at the stake; he sewed up together in sacks old men, women and children and threw them into the sea. He imported from Cuba sloop loads of trained blood hounds, and as these his fit associates met sturdy resistance from the free men of the mountains, whom they were employed to hunt, he admitted famished gangs of them to his prisoners, bound hand and foot in an enclosed arena. Night after night was this spectacle the amusement of his army, and of the delicate wives and daughters of those whom it was his business to reinstate in their ancient possessions!—says Métral the French historian of the expedition, "When the vessel laden with dogs reappeared in the harbor of the Cape, some of the *wives* of the colonists went to receive them upon the shore, making the welkin

ring with their cries of joy; they put garlands on them and strewed flowers in their path. Some even stooped to cover with *kisses* these strange and novel instruments of their vengeance. "To what mistakes (*égaremens*)," adds the mild and prudent historian, "does not slavery lead?" p. 182.—Here are "Horrors of St. Domingo" for us! Does the reader wonder why the freemen of St. Domingo named this war "*une expédition de cannibales*"? Does he wonder that they should drive the white race from their island? That they should make it a part of their organic law that no white should ever set foot upon their territory "*à titre de maître ou de propriétaire*"? Does any one after this fail to admire the magnanimity of the Haytian chieftains in availing themselves of the talents of *white men* for the improvement of their country?

To narrate the civil wars which grew out of these lessons taught the Haytian chiefs by the most accomplished generals of France, would swell inordinately an article already protracted much beyond our design. The violent reign of Dessalines lasted but two years. The quarrel of King Christophe and President Petion, left but little time to either to cultivate the arts of peace. The former, however, improved what he had much to the benefit of his subjects. He established the Lancasterian system of instruction in all his principal towns, and Harvey, a very unlightened and candid witness, bears testimony that his schools equalled, in all important respects, *the best of the same kind in England*.* The same gentleman describes the enterprise and industry of the people as marked, and their condition as infinitely superior to that of slaves. But Christophe's power was enough to corrupt a more enlightened man. His yoke became too heavy for a people who were at first proud of his talents. He built a splendid palace which he called *Sans Souci*, and a still more wonderful castle—almost the only things in Hayti which Franklin found to admire, and his tears over the ruins of which, show a love of tyranny even greater than his hatred of negroes. Like a true tyrant, as he was, Christophe perished by his own hands, October 8, 1820. In the mean time, republicanism had shown its better tendencies in the West and South. Jean Pierre

* Harvey's Sketches of Hayti, Lond. 1827. p. 204.

Boyer succeeded Petion in 1818, and renewed the war which his less energetic predecessor had remitted. The revolt of Christophe's subjects in 1820 opened to Boyer an easy conquest of the north, and he succeeded in reducing the whole Spanish part in 1822. The whole island is now governed under the constitution revised by Petion in 1816. The President holds his office for life with power to name his successor. In other respects the government is organized somewhat after the model of our own. A chamber of commons is elected by the universal suffrage of the people once in five years—and this body elects a senate which exists nine years.

The solicitude of the Haytians on the subject of education has won the commendation even of their enemies. We have already remarked the zeal and success of Christophe. His rival, Petion, was not behind him. At the present time primary schools are supported liberally by the government in all parts of the island under the supervision of eight committees of education. Higher schools are liberally assisted, and full license is given to teachers of all nations. Consul-General Mackenzie visited at the Cape in 1826, the "National School, now taught by a young mulatto, M. Papillon, who had been educated by Mr. Gullifer in the school established by Christophe. An examination of the pupils in French, English, grammar, and arithmetic, took place in my presence, and the eager anxiety of all the boys (between thirty and forty) showed that the teacher had succeeded in establishing the best ground of success—a spirit of emulation. One little mulatto boy was particularly acute, to the apparent discomfiture of a little black fellow, whose zeal far exceeded his ability. Upon the whole, however, talent appeared pretty equal among the castes." Notes on Hayti, vol. I. p. 156. He visited another school at Les Cayes where were 130 scholars, 100 hundred of whom were supported by the government. The Lycée at Port au Prince is the Haytian University, founded by Petion after the model of the Lycée of Paris. It is well supported and efficient.

The commerce of Hayti has risen from flat prostration to a value of from *eight to twelve millions of dollars per annum*. See Mackenzie's Notes, and Jay's Inquiry. In 1802 according to M. Humboldt, the population of the whole

island did not exceed 375,000 souls. In 1824, it amounted by the government census to 935,335.*

All this has been achieved beneath the frowns of the whole, so called, civilized world. France was not content with the atrocities of Rochambeau. The sovereignty which she could not regain by violence, she sought to recover by intrigue and bribery. Repeatedly she sent her commissioners to skulk along the shores of Hayti and excite dissensions among her chiefs. When these disgraceful measures proved unavailing, she sent Baron Mackau *with fourteen ships of war* to offer a recognition of independence on condition that France should pay but half the duties required of other nations and should receive in five equal annual instalments the sum of 150,000,000 francs! The government of Hayti has been reproached as pusillanimous because it did not resist this insolent and unrighteous claim. But Hayti was for peace. She paid the whole sum rather than renew the horrors of Le Clerc and Rochambeau. Says a French geographical work, published last year in Paris, "It is well known that the chambers of this republic voted the sum of 150,000,000 francs to indemnify, so far as practicable, the ancient French colonists. *The last instalment has been paid in 1835.* This is a rare example in such a case, and worthy of record." *L' Amerique &c.* Let the magnifiers of Haytian "horrors" and Haytian poverty and desolation account both for the *disposition* and the *ability* to pay for *peace* on such terms.

After most of this article had passed through the press we had the good fortune to procure a copy of Mackenzie's "Notes on Haiti," from which it appears that Edwards' story of the connection of Ogé, with the Amis des Noirs, had even less foundation than we supposed. Mackenzie seems to have been disposed to give currency to this calumny, but as Mr. Clarkson was by some of the French pro-slavery writers included in

* Mackenzie questions the truth of this and brings forward as the correct census a detailed statement which was laid on the table of the Haytian Chamber of Commons, in 1836, which makes a total of 423,042. This, however, has been shown to have been only an estimate of the portion of the community called on to contribute to the French indemnity.

the same conspiracy, he thought it prudent before his publication to apply to that philanthropist for information. The statement of Mr. Clarkson convinced Mackenzie that Ogé was driven to London by "pecuniary difficulties" and that he had bought this "*lieutenant-colonelcy*" himself. Notes &c. Vol. II. p. 18. Ogé fled from Paris to escape lodgings in jail, the persecution of his enemies, the white planters, having deprived him of the means of paying for lodgings elsewhere; and Clarkson, who had been known to him in Paris, paid his passage to America, purely through fear that the presence of such a person in London might injure the cause of the abolition of the slave trade! If the Amis des Noirs had smiled upon the designs of Ogé they would at least have paid his bills. See Clarkson's Letters, published at length in the appendix of Mackenzie's Notes. Vol. II. p. 246.

Our apology for this protracted dissertation must be found in the incalculable importance of the subject. Our country is the seat of the most cruel and unrelenting *prejudice of caste*, that exists, probably, on the face of this planet. This prejudice, and its inseparable curse, slavery, the most powerful minds in our country have sought to eternize. And to this end they have taken the case of St. Domingo and thrown the odium of its horrors, which are justly due only to its slavery, upon the holy doctrine of equal human rights. No less a man than JOHN MARSHALL, in his biography of the father of our country, holds such language as this: "Of that malignant philosophy which, disregarding the actual state of the world, and estimating at nothing the miseries of a vast portion of the human race, can coolly and deliberately pursue through oceans of blood, abstract systems for the attainment of some fancied, untried good, early and bitter fruits were gathered in the French West Indies. Instead of proceeding in the correction of abuses which might exist, by those slow and cautious steps which gradually introduce reform without ruin, which may prepare and fit society for that better state of things designed for them; and which, by not attempting impossibilities, may enlarge the circle of happiness; the revolutionists of France formed *the mad and wicked project of spreading the doctrines of equality among persons, between whom there exist distinctions and prejudices to be subdued only by the GRAVE.*" If we have not labored in vain, it appears that history

proves such language to be as FALSE, as conscience and revelation prove it to be WICKED.

1. Slavery stored the magazine of insurrection, and slaveholders alone applied the torch.

2. St. Domingo furnishes the most dangerous conceivable case for the application of *immediate abolition*. Yet such abolition was not only safety but salvation, though applied at the last moment of the eleventh hour.

3. In spite of the two most powerful nations in the world and of all the vices engendered by slavery, the emancipated slaves of St. Domingo have not only improved in industry but have regulated themselves by wise laws, and have increased in arts, comforts, and population beyond any parallel.

These are facts which it is vital to our country to know and regard.

WHITEFIELD AND THE SLAVEHOLDERS.

George Whitefield was as much a "fanatic" in his day as George Thompson, and came as near teaching that "slaves ought to cut their masters' throats." He met with the same revilings from slaveholders, both *clerical* and laical, as our friend Thompson has done. He excited the same demoniac outcry, *Let us alone*, "Art thou come hither to torment us *before the time*." Well, we have waited a *hundred years* and still it is "*before the time*!" Our Theological Reviewers tell us it is *not time yet*, for emancipation, and will not be *time* till the slaves are *taught*. The Rev. Plummerts and Baileys of the south tell us it is *not time yet*, and, if it were, we have no right to intermeddle. They say the owners use their slaves with all due humanity; if they do not teach them all they ought to, they are *about to do so*, and that our rash denunciations only mar all their incipient plans, and make the slave the *worse off*. Well, this song was sung, as we shall presently see, in 1740, and lacks but four years of being a century old.---Nay, it is as old as slavery itself. It was on the lips of the Reverend apologists of British slavery till it was drowned by the Jubilee trumpet on the morning of the First of Aug. 1834. It would be on the lips of our American apologists, our Gurleys and Tracys, our Beechers and Fisks, till the end of time, if slavery could last so long. What if Whitefield and his followers, instead of shunning *interference* for the peace of the churches, as they called it, had pressed the battle so well begun upon the foul fiend of slavery? Why, *we* should not have it to fight to-day;—nor would our opponents, the apologists, have been periling their souls in support of slavery to-day! Alas, when will the soldiers of Christ learn that it is bad generalship to leave the fortress of Satan pouring its hot shot and its infernal bombs upon their rear!

About the year 1740, Mr. Whitefield, it seems, wrote a "Letter to the inhabitants of Maryland, concerning the negroes." This was noticed "by Alexander Garden, M. A. Rector of St. Philip's, Charlestown, and Commissary in South Carolina," in the following terms:—

"In my humble opinion, sir, had you caused another *edition* to be printed at *Philadelphia* of the *Bishop of London's Letter to the masters and mistresses of slaves in these parts*, and dispersed the copies on your way, as you came through the several provinces, you had done much more effectual service than by the publication of your own. But if you knew of any such letter of his Lordship's being extant, I suppose you'll plead a *special call* for the publication of your own, and that answers all objections.

"You must inform them, (the inhabitants of Maryland, &c.) you say, in the meekness and gentleness of Christ, &c.—the *invective* is so apparent throughout this notable epistle, that these can only be taken for some *cant terms* you accustom yourself to in all your scribblings. But what is it you *MUST* thus *inform* them of? Why, that you *THINK* God has a quarrel with them, &c. Had God sent you charged with this *special message*, you might well say, you *MUST* inform them of it; but as 'tis only a matter of your own *thoughts*, the *necessity* does not so well appear. Your *thoughts* in the case may possibly be idle or ill-grounded, and so better kept at home. But God you *THINK* has a quarrel with them, and *for their abuse and cruelty to the negroes*. That God will have a quarrel with any of the human race for their abuse of and cruelty to others is a very just thought, and sinful out of all doubt it is, for any of those inhabitants to use their negroes as bad, nay worse, than as though they were brutes. But pray, sir, on what grounds do you bring this charge against the *generality* of those inhabitants who own negroes? Do you *know* this charge to be just and honest? Or have you sufficient evidence to support it? No: you only *think* it to be so, and *fear* it and *believe* it. But on the contrary, I shall presume, and on much better grounds, to think, fear, and *believe*, that your charge is false and injurious! and that the very reverse of it is true, viz: that what particular exceptions soever there may be as to *good usage* of slaves, (as some doubtless there are,) yet that the *generality* of owners use their slaves with all due humanity, whether in respect of *work*, of *food*, or *raiment*. And therefore I farther *think* and *believe*, that the *generality* of owners of slaves in the respective colonies, may bring their actions of slander against you; and that in a certain country I know of, you would be *indicted* for meddling as you have done in this matter, which may endanger the peace and safety of the community.

"Hitherto we have only your *thoughts*, your *fears*, and your *belief* on the matter; you advance a pace into *positive* assertions. And perhaps, you say, it might be better for the poor creatures themselves to be hurried out of life, than to be made so miserable, as they generally are in it. And indeed considering what usage they commonly meet with, &c.* I suppress the remainder of this, and the next following paragraph of your epistle, as judging it both sinful and dangerous to the public safety to reprint them. More virulence and falsehood cannot be contained in so few lines. For so far are the generality of slaves in these colonies

* The sentiment omitted was this, "I wonder they do not either put an end to their own lives or yours rather than bear such usage."

from being miserable, that I dare confidently vouch and affirm, and partly on my own knowledge, that their lives in general are more happy and comfortable in all temporal respects, (the point of liberty only excepted,) than the lives of three-fourths of the hired *farming* servants and day laborers, either in *Scotland*, *Ireland*, or even in many parts of *England*, who not only labor *harder*, and fare *worse*, but have moreover, the care and concern on their minds how to provide for their families, which slaves are entirely exempted from, their children being all provided for at the owner's charge. * * *

"As to the little or no *proper care taken by owners of the souls of their slaves* it is too sad a truth; and I tremble to think, what account they will give of it at the great day! A sore evil indeed! but for which, your letter, I conceive, will afford but a poor remedy. I cannot think so ill of *any*, as you do of most of them, viz: that *on purpose*, they keep their slaves ignorant of Christianity. I believe the reason of their being so kept, is the want of one certain uniform method of teaching them, and which I hope will soon be established with success. I readily agree that the objection to teaching them Christianity, viz: that it would tend to make them less governable, or worse slaves, is wild and extravagant; but wish you had a little explained, what you mean by the phrases, *Christianizing*;—and *MADE thorough Christians*;—and the *gospel preached with power*;—whether by these phrases, you mean things in the power of men? For sure I am, that Paul may plant, and Apollos water, but God alone can give the increase. Men may teach true Christianity, but no man can *make* a true Christian.

"Your compliment on *pastors and people*, and apprehended difference 'twixt the importation of *rum and bibles*, are no *exceptions* to the usual stile, modesty, or manners of your epistles, and particularly of this under consideration, which I have now done with, and remain,

Sir, your very

Humble servant,

ALEX. GARDEN."

"*Charlestown, July 30th, 1740.*"

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

THE most recent accounts from the West Indies are full of encouragement. The extreme reluctance of the planters to acquiesce in the new order of things, appears to be giving way. We are informed by a gentleman of high character and standing, lately arrived from Jamaica, that the remaining time of *apprentices* is now selling for as much in that colony as the same persons would have brought as *slaves for life*, previous to the emancipation act; that all fear of insurrection has vanished, and that the Christmas holidays were passed at Kingston, without any disorder calling for the interference of the magistrate.

The following is a letter which has appeared in the New-York Journal of Commerce, from a traveller by no means prejudiced in favor of abolition.

ANTIGUA, Jan. 10, 1836.

We arrived at this charming island a day or two since. Its harbor, or St. John's harbor is safe when once in it, but rather difficult of access. We could

not but remark how superior this seemed in verdure and in culture to the other islands where we have touched. The legislature of this colony, instead of accepting the apprenticeship system, as was done in the other dependencies set the slaves free altogether. Of course we felt much solicitude to know how their plan worked. What we saw with our own eyes was highly favorable. The testimony of the inhabitants accorded with it. By their account, there was no difficulty in procuring labor at one shilling sterling per day, and most persons think this cheaper than slave labor. One of the criteria is the price of property, and I was informed that real estate is changing hands briskly at an advance on former rates.

A clergyman connected with the army remarked to me that it was pretty generally conceded, that the \$100 000,000 granted as a compensation to the slaveholders here, was equivalent to a free gift; the value of the property not being diminished. I have met with but one gentleman, and he was a member of the council of Trinidad, who did not admit that property was rising in value from some cause or other. Some attribute it to the abundance of money in consequence of loans to the colonies and the compensation fund; others, to the high price of colonial produce; and others to the new system, or all combined. I will not pretend to theorize on this subject. I give the facts as they appear after eighteen months experience. I have always been opposed to the schemes of the abolitionists in our country, and still think the acts of the British Government gross violations of contracts; yet I trust that wherever truth leads, I shall be willing to follow. Certain facts I consider established:

1st. That labor can be obtained at reasonable rates. I infer this from the fact that the desire of the comforts and necessities of life induces the colored people to seek employment, and that when task work is given them, it is performed cheaper under the free than under the slave system.

2d. That in view of the apprentice system, properties have appreciated. Many speculators have considered estates here good and safe investments.

The sugar crop throughout the ten islands where we have been, is remarkably promising. In the French islands a desire was expressed that war might take place with us, with the expectation, I suppose, that their ports would see some rich prizes. The French Admiral, with one ship of war, has arrived at Gaudaloupe.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.

THE number of Anti-Slavery Societies now on our list is 440. From the first there has been a steady increase. A convention was held in Northampton, Ms. for the old county of Hampshire, at which, the body of the largest church in that ancient town, was well filled with delegates, and a society was formed. On the 2d of February the Rhode Island Anti-Slavery Convention assembled at Providence—by far the largest convention that ever met in that state on any subject. It added the eighth to the list of state societies. The report of its proceedings is accompanied by addresses of the highest ability. The anniversaries of the Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont state societies have been occasions of great interest and considerable accessions to the cause.

Perhaps no event in the past year deserves a more prominent place in our record, than the establishment of the Philanthropist, at New Richmond, Ohio, by James G. Birney, Esq. When Mr. Birney found that his printing establishment, if set up in his own state, Kentucky, would probably be demolished before it could issue a single sheet, he resolved to commence in Cincinnati. But there too the slaveholders had their convenient tools, ready to strike before hearing. And the

same reason which had brought Mr. Birney from Danville carried him to a little village up the Ohio, named New Richmond. Here he commenced a weekly paper advocating immediate emancipation, promising its removal in due time to Cincinnati. Before this time, we presume, the paper has been issued from that city; and we venture to predict that it will yet cross the river and be issued from Danville or Lexington.—Mr. Birney's paper has been read by thousands in the slave as well as the free states, and its suppression, now, will be a different thing from the destruction of the mere press and types before they had uttered their mighty voice. The slaveholders will surpass their own fatuity when they venture upon such a manifest outrage against freedom and truth.

One of the first effects of Mr. Birney's press was to call out a great anti-abolition meeting, in which, as a good Providence would have it, the "Declaration of Sentiments of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society" was read, and Mr. Birney was allowed to speak a few words in behalf of his cause.

The day of anti-abolition meetings is about over, and even *mobs* have been well nigh given up in despair. The last exhibitions of that species of warfare, never renowned for its courage, have been peculiarly mean and skulking. In New Hampshire the mob armed itself with *the forms of law* to tear from his knees in the pulpit of God's house the Rev. George Storrs, an Anti-Slavery lecturer. They are quite welcome to the good they got by his *trial*. In Connecticut a mob skulked around the meeting house where Mr. Phelps was lecturing and *threw stones* through the windows. They may yet have reason to repent their want of "property and standing" on that occasion. In the village of Willoughby, Ohio, a mob in frightful disguises took Mr. Alvord one of the Society's agents from his lodgings at mid-night, and carried him off six miles in an open wagon; at this point he was rescued by the keeper of a public house. The authorities of Willoughby thought proper to bind ever these ruffians, for trial at the county court. The ill success of these and other similar efforts, is doubtless to be accounted for from the fact, that the "gentlemen of property and standing" have for some time turned their eyes to the general and state legislatures for aid. It is a fatal mistake for those who would conquer arguments with brick bats and stale eggs, not to take with them sundry judges and Congressmen! Such weapons are safe only for the aristocracy. The present condition of Utica, however, proves them of little use, in the best hands, to turn the tide of abolitionism.

Legislation against liberty, thanks to the sturdy rectitude of our Puritan fathers is, if possible, a more "delicate subject" than Slavery itself. Hence a great deal has been said, and little done. The President in his Message, recommended that Congress should pass a law prohibiting, under severe penalties, the transmission through the mails of publications "intended to excite the slaves to insurrection." Mr. Calhoun in the Senate, reports on this part of the Message, that *such a law* would be *unconstitutional*. He would have Congress merely forbid the deputy postmasters to transmit into any state publications proscribed by the laws thereof. This, upon the beautiful theory that the Post-Office is to be made the machine of the States, and all its deputies the spies of the States. Till Mr. Calhoun finds some support for this theory, either in the constitution or common sense, his report may safely be left to neutralize the Message. Gov. Marcy, of New-York has occupied a large part of his message with a tirade against the Abolitionists, adapted, altogether to a southern latitude. The only legislation that has yet

grown out of it, is a resolution in the Senate, to withhold its share of the proceeds of the literary fund from the Oneida Institute! A gag law has been brought forward in the legislature of Rhode Island, and postponed for future action. In the legislature of Massachusetts the subject has been brought up on the imperious demand of South Carolina. This has led to a partial hearing of the Abolitionists before a committee, and will probably lead to a great deal of what the abolitionists want, discussion. If the northern legislatures pass laws against the abolitionists, they must do it on the *sic volo, sic jubeo* principle. It will not do to *hear* before striking. The great end of the instruments whom the people have clothed with a "little brief authority," is to make a good show at the south; they might go *further*, did they not well know that there is a great deal more of *conscientiousness* in their constituency, than they are the true representatives of.

The abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia has been truly the "vexed question" of this session of Congress. In the House of Representatives it was voted on the 8th of February, to refer the whole subject to a Special Committee with instructions to report that Congress *cannot* interfere with slavery in the States, and *ought* not to do so in the District of Columbia, and to assign *reasons*. Whether this committee will report or not is uncertain. But two things are certain, 1. The united South has made the greatest effort of which it is capable, to get a vote that *Congress cannot constitutionally, abolish slavery in the District* and has *failed*. We have a right therefore to interpret Mr. Pinckney's resolution as granting to Congress the *constitutional power* to abolish in the District. 2. Should the committee report, they can give no *new* reasons why it is *inexpedient* for Congress to exercise its power. The strongest reason is one which the committee will keep to themselves, but which we will not, to wit, it would injure the prospects of the northern presidential candidate! In the Senate, the prayer of the petition has in one case been rejected, *without reasons*. But the Senate is still open.

On the whole, the agitation in Congress has been of immense advantage. The cause of abolition has not been advocated with the utmost power on the floor of either house—that of immediatism, not at all. But SLAVERY *has been shown off*. The speeches of Calhoun, Preston, Wise, Hammond, Pickens, &c. &c. have had much the same effect as if the interior discipline of their plantations had been acted out on the same occasions. He who has heard or even read one of these speeches, needs no "pictorials" to teach him what the author is in the habit of doing and having done at home. The abolitionists have gained as much in showing the tyrannous and intolerable nature of slavery, as if they had brought the "overseers" of the honorable members with their "symbols of office," into the places of the honorable members, there to exercise their legal vocation of laying on the *thirty-nine lashes* upon the bare backs of men and women. Legislators who crack their whips over a whole nation, cannot have spared the humble backs on which they learnt such a glorious art.

CORRECTION.—In our last No., page 192, line 16th, for "ratio of deaths less the ratio of births," read, *ratio of births less the ratio of deaths*.

THE

Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine.

No. IV.—For July, 1836.

AFTER all our boasts about the importance of our political experiment to the cause of human liberty, it is certainly mortifying to find that our republic is about to become the sole patron of slavery. She already stands foremost. Her public policy has always been shaped in reference to the protection of her human flesh shambles, and she is now proceeding to the consummation of a plan for vastly extending the sway of the CHAIN and the CARTWHIP.—Hold! Did not the United States set the example of abolishing the African Slave Trade? Has she not branded that horrid traffic as PIRACY? True. But, unfortunately, humanity is not the only motive supposable. Maryland and Virginia would, probably, have been free states to day, had the African trade been permitted to continue. Its abolition made them the slave coasts of the states further South. It put their slaveholders in the place of the King Joes and the King Toms of Guinea; and it is a vain expectation that they will give up a system by which they can sell a boy of 20 years for a thousand dollars. No other tariff has operated so effectually for the protection of domestic production as the abolition of the Foreign Slave Trade. It gave the negro-growers of Maryland and Virginia at once the whole of the wealth that was before expended in the shipping and supplies of a long and hazardous voyage. It gave them the monopoly of a market, which before drew its supplies from a continent. And with this, remember, that, from the nature of the human animal, the “vigintial crop,” as it has been expressively termed, costs the planter almost nothing. Need we ask what checked the southward march of liberty? It was the hypocritical abolition of the slave trade!

Now, what shall keep things as they are? What shall eternize the hammer of the man-auctioneer, and the lash of the man driver, and work without pay? **THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE MARKET!** Aye, that is the policy, which, but for the "fanatics," would sow slave-raising establishments on every hill of New England! For who shall say that the men of even New England are proof against good markets?

Texas, if it can be *had*, will make half a dozen new slave states, will raise the price of slaves, will make plenty of sops for the Cerberuses, that might bark at the South, and plenty left for the curs, hounds, and puppies that have long been barking at the abolitionists. How wise the policy of sending a cut-throat ex-governor to become the conqueror of Texas!

While we have had rulers who have made it their business to frustrate God's physical laws against slavery, we have not wanted priests who have taken similar care of His moral laws—professing to preach the gospel, but, alas!—"devouring widows' houses,"—consenting with thieves—partaking with adulterers—bidding off souls at the shambles! Oh! what a refreshing consolation it is that God reigns! Under his good government the sanctimonious lamentations, the pious regrets, and the hypocritical promises of these sacerdotal oppressors, touching slavery, are beginning to be understood. Humanity shall be righted, and the ministry of reconciliation shall be vindicated from this shame. The monster that has thus sported with our country's fame, poisoned our politics, and corrupted the church of the living God, has dropped the mask. It remains, fellow citizens, to be seen, whether we will any longer submit to be led, and ridden, and gag-bitted by him. If we are altogether heedless of our poor neighbor, who has fallen among thieves, and welters in his gore by the roadside, are we also reckless of our own rights and our children's? No. When once awake, we are neither the one nor the other.

THE
QUARTERLY
ANTI-SLAVERY MAGAZINE.

VOL I.

JULY, 1836.

NO. 4.

INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY ON SLAVEHOLDERS.

THE influence which the institutions of a country and the character of the people mutually exert on each other, operating reciprocally as cause and effect, is always a subject of curious and interesting enquiry. The character of the people is the cause of the establishment and continuance of the institutions, and is in return formed, modified, and rendered permanent by them. So peculiar an institution as slavery, cannot be without great influence of some kind or other, upon the character of those among whom it exists. Its withering and debasing influence on the slaves is undenied and undeniable, and has extended its baneful effects to the whole race to which they belong. But this is not the object of our present enquiry. Our enquiry is into its effects on those by whose power and will it exists—on slaveholders. Of its origin we need not speak. It is sometimes said we inherited it from the mother country, but it is forgotten that if we had not chosen to retain the inheritance, we were at liberty when we became an independent nation to take some measures to dispossess ourselves of it. And alas! that this has not been done, shows that with the inheritance descended also the character and principles adapted to it.

What then is slavery, and what are its natural effects on slaveholders?

Let us take a survey of the southern portion of this country. We behold two distinct races of men inhabiting the same soil, and in some of the states nearly equal in numbers. These two races are marked by a difference of color, but this is their least distinction. The one race we behold in

possession of all the power of government, all the property, both in land and productions, living in ease, luxury, and indolence. The other race we behold without power, without land, without property of any kind, toiling yet gaining nothing—the fruits of all their toil being appropriated by the other race to their own use and aggrandizement,—poorly clad, coarsely and scantily fed, no means of acquiring property, no spot they can claim as a home, even their children claimed by the other race from birth as theirs, that to them as to their parents may be assigned the labors which shall minister to ease and luxury. This weaker race, parcelled out among the stronger are, each and all, under the absolute dominion of some one among the latter who calls them his, even as the beast and the fowl and the herb of the field are his. Practically they are regarded but as a higher order of brutes, by those who claim them, and provision is made to keep them in existence on much the same principle as it is for the lower animals, but it is for the body alone. The mind is almost totally neglected, and it is to be feared that the slaveholder views with regret any indication of mind beyond what is needful to the labors of the slave.

How is it that two races of beings possessing a common nature, can exist thus situated with regard to each other? By compulsion, by actual force alone. It was by violence that their ancestors were first enslaved, and by actual force alone is it that they are kept in their present condition. Let it not be said, it is by the sanction of law, too often made the standard of morality—for what is law in this case, but the combination of the strong to protect one another in the exercise of their arbitrary will and pleasure upon those who cannot resist. The laws which sanction slavery make no pretence to any foundation in reason or justice, but are in direct violation of the laws of nature and revelation. Let no one suppose, that the sanction of any body of men can make that right, which is in its nature wrong,—that man can sanctify what God condemns.

Slavery then is supported by arbitrary power alone, on the one hand, and submitted to from utter imbecility, on the other. And what may we expect the effect to be of this absolute dominion on him who holds it? Observe, he is situated in the midst of two races. With the one he is connected by the ties of kindred, by education, and a common interest,

with them he identifies himself, and towards them the sympathies of his nature as friend, neighbor, and fellow man are exercised, but with the other, though in the midst of them also, he feels no bond of union. Their interests, when not directly opposed to his own, are yet distinct from them; and the whole course of conduct pursued by the whites is a virtual denial of a common nature, and has accustomed him to regard the slaves as not allied to him by any relation calling for sympathy. And observe, it is over this latter race that he possesses power, that dangerous prerogative, with which mortals are not to be trusted.

This state of feeling, this total absence of sympathy, itself an effect of slavery, is the cause of farther effects. These subjects of his power, regarded by him not at all as fellow-creatures, but more nearly as a sort of inferior animals, interesting to him not at all for their own sakes, but only like brutes as the means of wealth, receive treatment not very dissimilar to brutes. What is required by custom, and is by common consent considered due from master to slave, includes very little more than is bestowed on his other live stock. Slavery's moral code has little resemblance to that of the Bible. What is held as due from slaveholder to slave, bears little resemblance to what is due from man to man. Justice, benevolence, and charity, which are felt to be due to fellow men, are not extended to the slave. Justice and sympathy to the slave as a man! what a preposterous idea, what would this be but emancipation?

The slave is thus practically considered as a mere animal, who, in return for his services, is entitled to such shelter, food, and care as will enable him to continue these services. And were he really the senseless animal he is sometimes affirmed to be, and could the mind degraded, and debased, be entirely brought down to the standard at which it is thus estimated, though even more deplorable would have been the lot of the slave when we consider the capacities of his nature, yet it would have been for his deprivations chiefly we should have lamented; for he might have rested like the brute submissive and contented with his lot. But happily, still I say happily, the human mind cannot be thus kept down. Man has not this power over his fellow man. He may oppress, enslave, and debase him, but his power over the mind has its limits. He cannot extinguish the spark of

heavenly origin within his fellow man, and it will send forth gleams from the breast of the meanest slave, asserting the rights of humanity, and pleading the claims of brotherhood.

But supposing the mind of the slave could have been thus kept down, the master's arbitrary power over him might be productive of no other effect on his own character, than the same power exercised over mere brutes, which is perhaps not so inconsiderable as may be imagined. How often is such power abused to cruelty, and how surely does such cruelty harden the heart, and render it capable of further acts of inhumanity. I speak not now of mere wanton cruelty, but how often, among the ignorant especially, do we see the passion of anger excited to a degree that seems perfectly preposterous, towards a poor unconscious animal, wholly ignorant of its offence. And it is observable that it is towards the more intelligent brutes alone that such feelings are excited, and by intelligence, real or supposed, designedly thwarting the master's wishes. The sagacious horse, the patient and also sagacious ox are among the greatest sufferers. "Oh he knows as well as I do which way I want him to go," or, "he's well enough able to draw it along," "I'll let him see who's to be master, it's only obstinacy in him," are the excuses offered by the enraged driver for his furious and cruel blows. And here we have some resemblance to the effects of a slaveholder's power over his slaves. Were the latter possessed only of brutal intelligence these effects would still sometimes follow. Man is far more apt than brute to excite man's passions. The slave then from his greater intelligence, is more liable to excite his master's passions, which vent themselves in the infliction of cruel punishments. But the slave has passions of his own which are excited in return, and whose manifestation is the source of new provocation. The spirit of man, however crushed, will sometimes rebel against oppression. It is remarkable that in many of the recorded cases of severe punishment to slaves, it was drawn upon them by what was called impudence to him who inflicted it. And what was this impudence, but some natural outbreking of a mind feeling its own rights. Thus from the very nature of the intercourse between master and slave, were experience silent on the subject, we might safely predict that bad passions and feelings must be in continual operation, which the former will

vent in acts of cruelty on the latter, thus producing suffering on the one side and demoralization on the other. Mr. Jefferson's testimony in confirmation of the truth of this opinion is too well known to need to be repeated, and will readily occur to the mind of the reader. Now, though all slaveholders are not carried to this insanity of passion, of which there have been most horrible examples, in some, yet all are subjected to the influence of the possession of arbitrary power, a trial which few among men can bear unhurt. And observe further, that from the very nature of the system coercion of some kind or other must be used. The slave is not kept for his own sake, but his master's, therefore he is to do his master's work, and from the nature of the case by what motive but coercion can he be induced to do it? No one will say he is bound to labor by any principle of duty, even supposing he had any instruction in morality, neither has he any other interest in performing it, except to escape the penalty of non-performance. Should there be any anomalous cases of individuals who have known how to make gratitude and the hope of reward do the work of the whip, they are evident exceptions and need not be here considered. This is not the usual system of slavery as actually existing in this country. If the slave is disobedient and will not work, he must be compelled to, or the relation of master and slave would be at an end. The master must then be in the habit of putting passion out of the question, of inflicting pain on his fellow creatures, for such they are. He will learn to do this with less and less reluctance, and should he inflict only what he considers necessary pain, even this will gradually harden his heart and weaken his sensibility to the sufferings of others, and from the state of society round him instances of more gratuitous cruelty continually come under his notice.

That familiarity with suffering weakens our sensibility, is matter of common observation. The young surgeon faints, perhaps, at the first operation he witnesses, but soon learns to perform the same without emotion. Even the philanthropist feels less pain in visiting the abodes of misery, than when he commenced his career. This is undoubtedly a part of our constitution; perhaps it is a happy one. Since it is sometimes necessary to inflict pain, it may be well there should be those who can do it without much suffering to

themselves. And circumstances may prevent this insensibility from becoming an entire brutalization of the whole man. In the case of the surgeon, he who inflicts suffering, does it with the expectation of producing some greater good to him who endures it. Though the philanthropist suffers less in view of misery than at first, yet the pure motive which actuates him will surely prevent his becoming callous to it. But with the slaveholder there is no such counteracting influence. If he orders his slave to punishment, the object in view is his own interest solely. If he sees such things done by others, he knows that the same or worse motives actuate them, nor is any kindly sympathy toward the sufferer called up to balance the natural effect of familiarity with such things. I can conceive of no situation more entirely adapted to render a man selfish and hard of heart, than to be thus continually deriving his own good, or what he esteems such, from the harm or the loss of others. The slaveholder has learned to consider the good of a certain portion of his fellow creatures as utterly unimportant in comparison with his own. This, indeed, is the most revolting aspect of slavery. A whole race of men are sacrificed to what is supposed to be the advantage of another race.

It must also be remembered, that this process of hardening the heart, begins before the man is himself a slaveholder. From a child he has been accustomed to see the punishment of slaves, and to see it by others considered as a matter of indifference. I can imagine no circumstances in which a child could be placed, better calculated to blunt his sensibilities, except, which must be frequently a concurring circumstance, where the child has power to be the procuring cause of punishment to gratify his childish passions. How far this exposure in childhood to such unhappy influences, palliates the guilt of the man, which undoubtedly in some measure it does, is not for us now to consider; our object being to point out the influence which such a system must inevitably produce on the character, not to pronounce judgment on the guilt of the slaveholder.

But if slavery calls into exercise so much that is evil, and operates so hurtfully in some ways, is there no good feeling or affection which it tends to nourish, no virtue for which it offers peculiar opportunity, is there no redeeming feature? Not one. I can find no counterbalancing good for this mass

of evil. The slaveholder has indeed opportunity to exert himself to prevent these bad effects on his own character, and this is all. The relation of master and slave being altogether a forced one, founded neither in nature nor reason, having no mutual advantages for its object, there result from it none of the harmonies, the reciprocal duties, and mutual good feelings which other relations involve, as of parents and children, of neighbors, of friends, of benefactor and dependent, of employer and hired laborer. There are no reciprocal duties. The slave surely owes none to his master, and for the relative duties of the latter, I never remember to have seen them explained in any treatise of morality. It would be much the same as to point out the duties of a pirate to his captives, in which it might be shewn, that to do them a small injury was better than a greater, and to leave them a bare subsistence out of what had been their own, might be called a duty. No; the only relative duties which their situation imposes on master and slave, are forgiveness on the one side, and repentance and restitution on the other. The latter annihilates the relation.

Nor let it be supposed that the influence of slavery on the master's character can be confined to his feelings and conduct in that relation, to his principles and sentiments on that subject alone, and that in other respects he may be the same as if no such influence existed. He who is cruel and unjust to one being alone, is a cruel and unjust man, though he may not be so to his son, his neighbor, or his kinsman. In the same situation, with the same temptation, he would shew himself the same to them. But the preceding observations are mostly founded on the general fact, that every affection, faculty, or passion of our nature gains force by being called into exercise. Now those which slavery calls into exercise are bad. The bad parts of the slaveholder's nature are, therefore, strengthened, and what is to ensure that they shall never appear in his intercourse with any but his slaves. It is certainly true that he does not shew himself *equally* bad towards others as to his slaves. He has not the *power*, and therefore, neither has he the habit. Custom and the opinion of his fellow citizens would not sanction it. And then the state of his feelings in regard to the whole race to which his slaves belong, is such as to make a very sensible line of distinction between his conduct towards

them and towards others. Though he does not use the words, yet the general impression on his mind is that of their being what may be called semi-human.

Montesquieu's admirable irony—"It is impossible that we should suppose the slaves to be men, because if they are men, it would begin to be believed that we are not ourselves Christians," represents more nearly than may be supposed, the actual reasonings of slaveholders; not their open and avowed reasoning, not in this naked form avowed even to themselves. But the secret sophistry by which they succeed in excusing to themselves their own conduct, would, if analyzed, be reduced to this.

They are unwilling to suppose that the keeping of slaves is wrong. What from childhood they have been accustomed to consider right,—what it would be so contrary as they suppose to their interest to think wrong,—what they see done by persons calling themselves Christians,—nay, by persons who in other respects do appear to be good and Christian men, they first take for granted from these slender premises, must be right. But then the glaring inconsistency strikes them. How can it be right to deprive fellow men of what they feel in their own persons to be the most sacred rights of humanity—to degrade men to the condition of brutes? How is it conformable to Christian precept, to do unto men what they would not for worlds should be done unto themselves? In this dilemma, persuaded and resolved to believe that slavery is justifiable, and not inconsistent with the Christian religion, they are prepared to receive the hypothesis, that the slaves are scarcely men, that they are at least so far deficient in intellect and feelings, as not to have altogether the rights of men, an hypothesis to willing minds rendered plausible by the debased condition in which the slaves are actually found. It is needless to say how entirely this debasement is accounted for by the natural effect of slavery. It is, however, sufficiently striking to countenance or even suggest the idea, with those who do not reflect deeply, or not fairly, that the slaves belong to an inferior race. Whether the supposition of the inferiority of the negro race was first invented as an excuse for enslaving, or whether being first suggested by their low condition in slavery, it was immediately caught at and appropriated to this purpose, is difficult to determine. But it is still kept

alive by the course of reasoning, if it deserve the name, to which we have referred. They are convinced of its truth, because this only is consistent with some other things of whose truth they are convinced, and truth is always consistent with itself.

Negro inferiority is hinted at with sufficient frequency, to shew that a belief in it in some mode or degree is the prevailing feeling among slaveholders. But this is not the only plea on which they rest the defence of slavery to the world and their own consciences. *Necessity* has been made to excuse slavery, as it has done many a "devilish deed beside," either the necessity of safety to themselves, which they profess to believe would be endangered by releasing their captives, or the necessity of protection and guidance to the slaves, which they appear to suppose can be accomplished in no other way than by the continuance of slavery, or using the word with still greater latitude, (I should say with most ludicrous latitude, did not the feeling of indignation quench the sense of the ridiculous,) some have actually talked of the necessity of sugar and of cotton as an unanswerable argument for slavery. Others again solemnly tell us that the slaves are in the condition in which Providence has placed them, and it may be, really persuade themselves that by this view of the case, which the highwayman or the murderer would be equally authorized to take of the situation of their victims, they remove all guilt.

These are some of the reasons offered in defence of slavery, and which doubtless are often supposed by those who use them to be a real justification of slavery. There is nothing strange, nothing anomalous in this. So it is that in some way or other, men continually endeavor, and too successfully, to deceive themselves. If we will not see the truth, we have the power of shutting the mind's eye upon it. But alas for the man who does this. The pillar of his uprightness is undermined, the purity of his sincerity is soiled. How wretched then, and debasing must be the effect upon the character, of a system which *requires* these arts of disingenuousness and self-deception for its support. True, a man may be unfair on one point, yet fair on others. But surely, of all mental and moral habits, that of wilfully perverting the truth must be among the most pernicious. It must obscure and confuse the understanding. It is poisoning the

very sources of thought and of action. We could not, and we ought not, to feel the same confidence in one whom we had ever detected in this mental falsehood, which we feel in him whom we have only seen in guileless sincerity and singleness of purpose endeavoring to know and to do his duty. We instinctively perceive that where interest or inclination come in the way, the reason and the principles of such an one are not to be depended on. Will the slaveholder who has taught himself to believe that right, which to an unbiased mind is most evident, as well as most outrageous injustice, find it difficult to prove lesser cases of wrong to be right? Will he in lesser cases be the nicest and the strictest of moralists? Impossible. The lawfulness of slavery, and the principles by which he makes it lawful, are in his mind as truth, and other actions are brought to this standard, easily coming up with it, though falling far, far below the standard of right and truth. It cannot be that the whole set of feelings and principles belonging to the practice and justification of slavery can exist in the mind entirely separate and distinct, without influencing, in some degree the moral judgment in other cases. The general tone of moral feeling must be lowered by it.

These remarks apply particularly to those who have persuaded themselves by false reasonings that slavery is justifiable, who are, if the expression may be allowed, slaveholders on principle. But for those, and there are such, who perceive and even acknowledge the impossibility of reconciling slavery with justice, and who yet are slaveholders, it is surely needless to remark on the evil effect on their character, of thus acting in open defiance of their own convictions.

There are others, perhaps, who, influenced by custom and education, simply take for granted that slavery is right and proper, without troubling themselves with much thought as to how it may be justified. They do not even reason far enough to perceive its obvious inconsistency with religion and justice, and therefore have no need of sophistry to reconcile them. On such simple minds even slavery will not have the evil effect of nourishing the habit of self-deceit and perversion of the truth. Other bad effects it may have, but not this. And yet the injustice of slavery is so very obvious, the institutions of our country, and the language constantly

used in regard to them, are so peculiarly adapted to bring home its injustice to the mind of an American, that it is scarcely credible that there should be many so obtuse as never to have felt a doubt on this subject. The truth probably is, that the delusion of the majority is neither wholly wilful, nor wholly involuntarily. Adopting from others the standing arguments in defence of an institution which the involuntary prejudices of education and association lead them to believe a right one, they do not wish to find any flaw in their arguments, and therefore do not give them a fair examination. They are not wholly thoughtless of the subject, but their thoughts seek and tend only to confirm their previous convictions. And, as was said before, most unhappy must be the influence upon the character of individuals and of the community of an institution, which naturally leads to this sort of equivocation and insincerity. For no moral act is an isolated, an unconnected act. It is not only right or wrong in itself, but as it is so, it exerts a good or bad influence upon the character. Habit so binds our actions together, that he who has once committed a particular fault, is more likely to do the same again. He who has once wilfully perverted the truth, will be less honest with himself on another occasion. But the self-dishonesty of the slaveholder cannot be considered as one act; it is a continually recurring, an habitual act. As slavery is interwoven with the texture of society, so is the habit of justifying it by sophistical reasonings interwoven with the character of those who form that society.

Here it may be observed, that the more enlightened is the community in which slavery exists, the greater will be the degree in which this effect will take place. For obviously the members of such a community must more frequently come in contact with the truth on this subject, or at least into its near neighborhood, though by dexterous management they may avoid bringing it home to their "business and bosoms." The light which illuminates other matters would also shine upon this, were it not warded off by the shield of sophistry. In a barbarous, or semi-barbarous state of society, slavery may exist as with less moral guilt, so also with fewer evil effects upon the character. For a similar reason, a greater degree of self-deception, or perversion of the truth, must be needed by an American slaveholder, than by

any other. Though not more enlightened on other points, yet surely in respect of liberty and equal natural rights, it must be more difficult for him than for the native of another country, to escape collision with those very truths which are most directly and diametrically opposed to slavery. This great evil of naturally leading to a disengenuous character, and an unfairness of mind, belongs to slavery in its intrinsic nature as essentially unjust. As an unjust institution, it belongs to every form and degree of it, however modified and however leniently the master's power may be exercised. It must likewise belong in some greater or less degree to every unjust institution, or custom of society, modified, as in the case of slavery, by the degree of light enjoyed by the community or the individual. The worst effects must of course arise from those which are the most strikingly and obviously unjust: and in this respect slavery stands pre-eminent. A master may be kind to his slaves, with such kindness as is consistent with their state of slavery, yet still the question must sometimes occur, whence comes my right to exercise this power over them, a question which, so long as he is resolved to continue a slaveholder, it is not easy for him to answer fairly.

Another effect of slavery must not be forgotten. Accustomed to be waited upon, surrounded by those who may always be called upon to relieve him from the slightest exertion, the slaveholder naturally becomes indolent and indisposed to exertion. It is well known that it is considered even disgraceful for a white person to perform any kind of manual labor. Labor is considered so much the province of the darker race, that one of the other class shrinks from it as assimilating him too much with them, just as in savage tribes, where labor is the part of the women, man thinks himself degraded by it. This is, perhaps, partly the consequence, partly the cause of the indolence and love of ease which are always spoken of as characteristic of slaveholders. On the less intellectual minds, the effect of this state of things must be very debasing. They are driven by it to seek occupation in the lowest pleasures.

But all this, it may be said, is a mere theory, which if not confirmed by facts, must fall to the ground. It would be all very well, may the slaveholder say, did we not know ourselves not to be such heartless, cruel, and deceitful men, as

it is here represented we must of necessity become. And travellers and sojourners among them may tell of their hospitality and kindness, and deny that the effects of slavery are so very bad. Nothing was further from the design of the foregoing remarks, than to represent all slaveholders as totally depraved, and the "milk of human kindness" as utterly dried up within them. Far be it from me, or any opponent of slavery, to wish to represent the character of slaveholders as worse than it really is. So far as facts limit the application of the remarks which have been made, let them be limited. The natural influence of slavery has been spoken of, but it has not been forgotten that this is not the only influence which goes to form the character of slaveholders. Facts may, and do prove that these counteracting influences prevent much of the evil which we should naturally expect to flow from slavery. Yet still the tendency exists. The evil influence operates, is constantly operating, none of it is lost. May we not say, that in truth it produces, though less visibly, its full effect. For though good influences counteract it, they in their turn are counteracted by it, and produce less good than they otherwise would. A body acted on by two opposing forces, is carried forward by the superior force with a velocity lessened exactly by the amount of the inferior force, and the latter cannot surely be said to have been without effect.

But do facts tell nothing to *confirm* the views here taken of the natural effects of slavery? And first it must be observed, that these views are founded upon facts, the leading facts of slavery itself, and the general facts of human nature, as proved by every day's experience. But more particularly, war perhaps excepted, where can such instances of cruelties and atrocities which make the blood run cold be found, as the annals of slavery furnish? Read the accounts of the evidence given to Parliament during the debates respecting the abolition of the slave trade. I refer not now to cruelties practised in connection with the slave trade, but to those committed by the planters at home. Read Stephen on West India Slavery, read the Anti-Slavery Reports, and for specimens of the horrors of slavery in our own country, look at the too abundant collection of them in our own anti-slavery publications. Walsh adds his testimony, that the same cause produces the same effect in Bra-

zil, in the instances he has given of cruelty to slaves in that country.—(See his Notices of Brazil.) Of these, and other recorded cases of atrocities, it may be said, that they are picked cases, that anti-slavery writers have hunted them out, and proclaimed them with unwearied zeal and diligence. Admitted. But in what state of society, where slavery was not tolerated, could such cases have been picked out? Single instances of cruelty have been perpetrated in every country, but no zeal and no diligence could furnish forth lists of atrocities so numerous and so frightful, committed in England or New England in the same space of time. I know not how facts could furnish stronger evidence of something in the system of slavery peculiarly calculated to foster bad passions, and the spirit of cruelty. Not that these horrors are to be confounded with the every day aspect of slavery, nor that every slaveholder is implicated in them. But if in some it produces such results, it shews the *tendency* of the system. Add to this, that these things do not appear to be viewed by slaveholders with the same indignation and horror which they naturally excite in us. In the West Indies, the perpetrators could with difficulty be brought to justice, and often escaped unpunished; and in our southern states, the penalty is frequently wholly disproportioned to the offence, as for instance, a fine only, for cutting out the tongue, or putting out the eye of a slave.

From the accounts of travellers, also, it appears that the general state of morals in slaveholding communities is usually low. This is no more than one would expect, but it confirms the justice of the expectation. Must not the iniquitous laws in slaveholding communities, relative to slaves and free people of color, be regarded as some evidence of the deleterious influence of slavery on the character of the people who passed them? In the proceedings of the Georgians towards the Cherokees, do we see no indications of a character formed upon slaveholding principles, acting itself out in other relations.* If such then are the tenden-

* The contempt of law and justice, and all the forms by which they are secured, has, since these remarks were first penned, been exhibited in the most alarming manner, in the mobs, which, in the southern states, under the name of Lynch law, have committed the most ferocious violations of property and person. We have seen the Postoffice in a large city robbed of its contents, and men of established character openly aiding in the felony. We have seen American citizens savagely scourged and murdered by large assemblages of men reputed respectable, and the

cies of slavery, to form a haughty, irascible, and cruel character, and at the same time indolent and inactive, to undermine the very foundations of morality and honesty in the mind, to keep down all noble and generous sentiment, how grievous a punishment for its iniquity does it carry with it? Poor slaves, you are avenged!

It is perfectly evident, that such a degraded population as the slaves cannot exist in the heart of a country without some effect upon the character of those among whom they are intermingled. Though there were nothing peculiarly injurious in the relation in which they stand to the rest of the community, nothing wrong in slavery, still inevitable would be the degenerating effect on that portion of the community of intercourse with a people so ignorant, so degraded in moral principle, and far from being in the way of improvement, most cautiously shut out from it. This effect may be less than if this degraded part of the community were separated from the rest by a less distinct line, but it must exist. There must be some among the more enlightened portion, but little raised above the slaves in point of intellect and morals, who will naturally be brought still nearer to the level of these last by contact with them, and will then help to demoralize and debase others within the sphere of their influence. So it is, and so it must be in all cases; the degraded tend to degrade, the good and enlightened to elevate the society of which they form a part.

But the principal and most striking effect which mere intercourse with the slaves, apart from the peculiarities of that intercourse must have upon the white population, must, no doubt, be as it operates upon the children. The child of a slaveholder is brought up very much in the society of slaves. Slaves are continually about him to take care of him, and wait upon him. They are so much his companions, that even his language is acquired from them, and he learns to speak the mutilated English, so common among the ignorant negroes. This fact has been remarked by strangers. If these attendants are artful, deceitful, and

perpetrators of these outrages going abroad in open daylight, in bold defiance of the violated laws, which, struck dumb in the presence of slavery, raises no voice of re-monstrance. Worse than all, we have heard these atrocities vindicated by men of education and standing, and even by an honorable Senator in his place in Congress.

unprincipled, how can the poor child fail to be corrupted by their influence? The evil of leaving children much with ignorant servants, has become a maxim in education; but here the slaves are more degraded than common servants. The effect of slavery on the children of slaveholders is too important a part of our subject to be passed over hastily. Not only is the character of the man modified by its influence, but ere he became a man, it was formed under that influence. In almost every one of the ways in which slavery has been shewn to be injurious to the enslaving race, it begins to be so in childhood. A parent may give his child many lessons of humility, benevolence, and disinterestedness, but his "education of circumstances" will teach him more effectually to be proud, arbitrary, passionate, selfish, careless, and insensible to the sufferings and feelings of others. How can the parent give him even a distinct idea of the nature and requirements of justice? How give him an explanation consistent with slavery, of those simple words, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," without at the same time teaching him to evade their force and meaning? One would think that the half honest slaveholder, shocked at the thought of thus early destroying the fairness and simplicity of his child's mind, would sometimes be himself converted to justice, while teaching him the first rudiments of morality. But, alas! we do not often see this to be the case; and alas for the poor children thus early taught to confound right and wrong.

It was said by Mr. Burke, that the masters of slaves would, even more than other men, be attached to freedom, because with them it was not merely a right and a blessing, but a privilege and a distinction. It may be so, events seem to have proved that he was right; but there is in such a love of freedom nothing ennobling, nothing elevated. It is a selfish, and not a generous sentiment. Though he who entertains it would yield his life sooner than his liberty, though he make all exertions and all sacrifices, his conduct is not more to be admired than that of the man who endangers his life rather than his gold, but refuses to give to his needy brother the portion of that gold which is his due. Here, then, is another evil effect of slavery, that it turns to poison what would otherwise be a wholesome and generous fruit, the natural growth of America. The love of liberty,

in others a noble affection, but makes more selfish the selfishness of the slaveholder. Let those who love freedom after a different sort, for others as well as for themselves, for its own sake, and its own intrinsic beauty and justice, reserve their admiration for those who have given up their prospects of wealth, and sacrificed their personal convenience, not to gain freedom for themselves, but to give it to others, even to the poor slaves, whose destiny was in their power. Some such examples have been presented to our admiration; would there were more such! Cavillers may deny to them the praise of generosity, since it is but what bare justice demands. This is true, and yet none but a generous mind would be capable of such an act of justice. None other would so discern and acknowledge the rights of others, which neither law nor custom required him to regard.

I have thus endeavored, in all faithfulness and love, from the very nature of slavery, to infer its almost inevitable influence on the character of slaveholders, and to shew that facts fully confirm the truth of this inference. Could I hope to gain the ear of one slaveholder, I would say to him, "Look around you, consider with fairness whether you can behold nothing to confirm the remarks which have been made on the natural effects of slavery? Is it no motive with you to do something to remove this curse from yourself, your friends, and your country? If you will not bear to hear the slaves spoken of as beings who have claims upon your justice and sympathy, have you no regard to your children? Will you choose to bring them up in circumstances which you know must be so injurious to them? Will you place them in this dilemma, that either they must see their father's injustice, or lose their own perception of right and wrong? But still more. Are the effects which we have seen to flow from slavery no ground for supposition, that there is something radically evil and iniquitous in the system which produces such evil fruit? Is it not because it is iniquity and unrighteousness that these evil effects flow from it?"

And now a few words to those who are neither slaveholders nor approvers of slavery. 1st. It must be remembered that the state of things at the South is a trial and temptation of a peculiar kind; these effects are incurred, not altogether voluntarily. It must in charity and justice be

remembered, that they are brought up under this system. Justice requires us to acknowledge, benevolence that we acknowledge gladly, that the natural and unavoidable prejudice of education and custom furnish great palliations for the conduct of slaveholders. But justice also forbids that we should view it as a complete justification; for what would this be but to say, that unrighteous customs, which have once got footing among men, must, by the necessity of our nature, be entailed on us for ever, since we are not furnished with faculties equal in such a case to discerning good from evil. But 2d. As it is their duty, though a hard one, to change this state of things, so it is ours to urge it upon them, since we are more favorably situated than they for discerning truth and duty on the subject. 3d. Let us beware that the demoralizing and truth-obscuring influence of slavery do not weaken our own moral sense, and blind us to our own duty in regard to this national sin. That this influence has in some degree extended over the whole country, is too plain to be denied by any one not himself affected by it. How often do we hear people in the northern states palliating, or even justifying, slavery, in a style worthy a slaveholder. Sometimes from the influence of southerners, with whom they are connected, sometimes from the cruel and too common prejudice against color, which in its origin must be traced back to slavery, sometimes from an unwillingness to see any iniquity in the land of their birth, and sometimes from less worthy motives, they would fain believe that slavery is not so great an outrage upon every principle of justice as to common sense it appears. In proving this, their own views of the principles of justice become strangely and sadly confused.

Here, then, among ourselves, we have a great duty to perform. Let us endeavor to bring slavery, as it actually exists, with all its guilt and all its suffering, fairly before us, and shew it to others in the same clear light in which we behold it ourselves. It is thought of and talked of too much as an abstraction, rather than what it is, a tremendous reality. No one who brought home to his mind the reality of slavery, and of the cause in which the abolitionists are engaged, could consider his zeal and his warmth, however great, a fit object for a smile or a sneer, as if in pity for his amiable weakness, or contempt of the lowness and vulgarity

of the cause. Yet how often has the abolitionists met this smile and this sneer. But he heeds them not. 'The greatness of the principles he is endeavoring to establish, and the importance of the objects involved in them, are all absorbing to his mind, and he is not discouraged. Let us then go on and endeavour to arouse the slumbering consciences, and awaken the sympathy of all who come within our influence; and when a correct moral feeling is established here, through us it will extend to the South, and slavery will be no more.

LETTER TO A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

To the Rev. ———.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,—I rejoice to hear you say, that in my views and feelings on the system of American slavery, you agree with me. In your mind, it is clear and certain, that it is a system of rebellion against God—involving fraud, adultery, and murder, the violation of every tie which binds man to man, and earth to Heaven. This system, you declare, ought immediately to be broken to pieces, and scattered on the winds. But with these declarations on your lips, you censure me for exposing *in the pulpit* its various deadly tendencies, and for urging on the hearts of all who heard me, the claims of the enslaved upon their sympathy and assistance. You tried to give point and effect to your censure by repeating in my ears the declaration of the Apostle Paul: "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." You exhorted me as a preacher of the gospel, to imitate the Apostle to the Gentiles, and give myself up exclusively to the salvation of souls.

I do not feel myself at liberty to disregard either your censure or exhortation. With you, I bow reverently and gratefully to the authority of the Bible. If, in the matter before us, you are sustained by that authority, it is mine promptly, cheerfully, and fully to obey you, as the messenger of Heaven. But I am greatly a stranger to your character, if you can blame me for examining the basis of

your appeal, before I yield to its intended influence. Nay, I feel assured that you will join with me in endeavoring clearly and certainly to ascertain the *meaning* of the Apostolic declaration, which you wish me to heed.

You understand the Apostle to confine his attention, as a christian teacher, to a very small circle of topics; comprehending only the more commanding doctrines of the gospel. Among these, you suppose that the divinity of Christ, and the atonement by His blood, claimed a place peculiarly prominent. From these he never allowed himself so widely to depart, as to introduce to the church subjects so far removed from the vitals of Christianity, as the evils of servitude and the claims of the slave. You blame me for not imitating the example of the Apostle, and excluding from the lessons of instruction I may give, the doctrines of abolitionism. But after making the declaration, which you quote, did the Apostle exclude such topics from *his* discourses? In answering this question, so manifestly fair and appropriate, you will eagerly embrace such conclusions as the Epistle itself, which contains the declaration in question, forces on our convictions. Read the Epistle, my brother, and see over what a large field the Apostle allows himself to expatiate! What a variety of objects catch his attention, and employ his powers! In one place he forces on your loathing eye the incest of a member of the Corinthian church, and the shameful neglect of his brethren to subject him to christian discipline; in another, he points out to you the limits within which you may have intercourse with flagrant sinners. Here he exposes and condemns the conduct of such christians as had law-suits before heathen courts; and there he enters freely upon the discussion of the subject of marriage. With one breath he disposes of the difficulties which might embarrass his christian brethren, when invited to partake of food which had been "offered in sacrifice to idols;" and the next, he employs in asserting the claims of the christian teacher to a competent support; and the third, in enforcing upon females the importance of their appearing *veiled* in religious assemblies. Nor does he overlook the condition and the duties of those who were under the bonds of servitude. *He points them to the basis of freedom, to which the gospel had raised them.* But I need not swell the list of topics, to which in one connection and another he directed the

attention of his readers. It is very certain, that by the declaration to which you refer, the Apostle *did not* intend to exclude from his discourses such things as you blame me for discussing. What, then, did he mean? A fair question, which is entitled to an appropriate answer.

Permit me, my brother, to remind you, that when the Epistles to the Corinthian church were written, "excellency of speech and of wisdom" were generally thought to consist in the subtleties of a hair-splitting philosophy, and in artificial rhetoric. Such acquisitions, in a city like Corinth, remarkable for its wealth and luxury, would naturally be held in high estimation. What multiplied hints have we in the epistles, with which we are now more especially concerned, that for the Corinthian church such glittering baubles had strong attractions! Apollos, educated as he had been at Alexandria, seems as the head of a party, to have been preferred to Paul on account of the charms of his rhetoric. With these thoughts in your mind, mark what the Apostle disclaimed, in opposition to the course he pursued, as described in the declaration which we are now to dispose of. "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with *excellency of speech or of wisdom*, declaring unto you the testimony of God." What did he then? "For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." What ever distinguished the Gospel from systems of human philosophy and heathenish superstition, the Apostle here presents under the description of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. In the first place, then, *I understand him to affirm, that in what ever he did, he acted in subserviency to the progress of the Gospel.* He had not aimed at Corinth to distinguish himself as a philosopher or rhetorician. He had not exerted himself to accumulate gold or brighten his reputation. Secular designs he had none to promote. A higher object engrossed his powers. To build up the church of Christ, and thus subserve the best interests of his fellow-men, was the sole end of his solicitude and toil. To nothing, which had a bearing, near or remote, adverse or friendly on such an end, could he be indifferent. Even the veil for a woman's face became here a matter of deep interest—too important to be overlooked in a pastoral letter.

I understand the Apostle to affirm, in the second place, *that he was anxious to present, and illustrate, and enforce*

every lesson of instruction he might give, in the light of the peculiarities of the Gospel. On whatever subject he might dwell, he did not choose to speak as an economist, or politician, or philosopher. A higher character he sustained. The various relations of those with whom he had to do, he contemplated in a more solemn light. *To his eye, the truths of the Gospel shed their lustre on every thing.* And what his eye saw, his tongue and pen could not but choose to describe. Whatever he might exhibit, he was "determined" to hold up in the light which shone from the face of the crucified Savior. Was he constrained to expose the guilt of the church, in allowing a gross fornicator to keep his place at the communion table? Who, taking his position *at the foot of the cross*, could adequately estimate that guilt? What motives to "purge out the old leaven" pressed upon their inmost spirits, when they remembered that "Christ their passover was sacrificed for them!" Would the Apostle dissuade his brethren from such intercourse with idolaters, as might be the occasion of apostacy to weaker members of the church? With what resistless force must his tender appeal have reached their hearts, when he admonished them, that through their "knowledge the weak brother" might "perish, *for whom Christ died!*" Would he persuade "servants" to maintain their allegiance to their Savior, whatever opposition they might meet with from their masters? How appropriate and powerful is the argument he urges,—"*Ye are bought with a price; BE NOT YE THE SERVANTS OF MEN.*" Thus, whatever truth he might be called to present, he was determined to present it as a christian minister, betaking himself to Jesus Christ and Him crucified for arguments and illustrations.

Will you say, my brother, that I have lost sight of the example of the Apostle, either in introducing or disposing of the subject of slavery in my religious discourses? You cannot say so. Have I dwelt upon it as an economist, or politician, or philosopher? Have I sought applause as a rhetorician? Have I courted popularity for money or a name? No. Had I been guilty in any of these respects, I should have escaped the odium and reproach which, with no very sparing hand, have been measured out for me. No; it was because on the subject of slavery "I determined not to know any thing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

that I have been reviled and slandered. I have presented the slave as a *brother*—the child of our common Father; redeemed by our Savior, and entitled to all the benefits suited to such high relations. This is “the head and front of my offending.” What if I were to gather a congregation of southern slaves around me, and expound and enforce for their benefit the direction of Paul, “Ye are bought with a price; *be not ye the servants of men!*” should I not preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified?

You remind me, that it is my appropriate business, as a preacher of the gospel, *to toil for the salvation of souls*. Your admonition I receive with humility and gratitude. Be it my privilege while I live, thus to labor. But may I pause; and dwell upon the meaning of your language? In what must the salvation of souls consist? In such fears, and hopes, and joys, as however they may agitate us, fail to reduce us to our proper places in the moral system, to which we belong? Then were the Scribes and Pharisees saved; for they seem to have had no lack of such feelings. Does it consist in maintaining, without reproach, a profession of religion, or in activity in such enterprises, as have the patronage of the church, with which we may be connected? Then were the wretches saved, who the Savior declares devoured widows’ houses, and for a pretence made long prayers! They were full of missionary zeal;—“compassing sea and land to make a proselyte.” *To be saved, we must come into conformity with the relations we sustain to God and our neighbor*. Short of this we may have our fears, and hopes, and joys, our religious professions and enterprises. Short of this, we may make high pretensions, long prayers, and many proselytes. Short of this, we may employ with wonderful success a thousand so-called soul-saving expedients. But short of this, *we cannot be saved*. Short of this, what could we do in that world of eternal harmony, where every thing finds and keeps its proper place? *The devourers of widows’ houses here, must receive damnation hereafter*. Alas! what then must become of those who MAKE WIDOWS, and then DEVOUR THEM AND THEIR CHILDREN in the midst of the American churches? What must become of their apologists, however ingenious and grave they may be? What, my brother! have you a system of soul-saving, which inspires men with the hope of Heaven,

while they refuse heartily to *own every human* creature as a brother? A system of *piety*, which leaves men below the level of humanity! Can you make *saints*, who *fall short of being MEN*? Out upon such saints. Away with such piety. It makes any creature, who is deceived by its lofty pretensions, "two fold more the child of hell," than it found him. I have heard of some "young converts," who would not join a church that treated men *as men*, according to their moral worth! If prejudice, the most insane and cruel, could not be humored, and factitious distinctions maintained;—if they must take their place at the communion table, by the side of their poor brother, of another complexion, their offended dignity would turn away, and stand aloof from the Savior's "little ones!" I have heard of a church, which suited its arrangements to such views and feelings, and bowed before the giant prejudices of its young converts; and gloried in its shame, by baptizing its anti-christian expedients by the name of *efforts to save souls*! Out, I say, upon such notions of salvation. Romance for reality! Animal feeling for christian principle! False philosophy, for "Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

Are you the man, my brother, to talk of saving those, whose hearts are too hard and narrow to admit the common sentiments of humanity! Alas, this piety, both un-human and inhuman, what mischief has it not done wherever it has been countenanced in the church of God! What! Is God, our Savior, to be honored with *human sacrifices*! Human nature to be placed a bleeding victim on the altar of Piety! Men, women, and children to be offered by thousands to Moloch in the midst of the monuments of Christianity, without admonition or rebuke! Nay, ministers, and elders, and deacons, "binding the sacrifice with cords unto the horns of the altar!" And we, preachers of the Gospel, in the midst of these abominations, must close eyes, ears, and lips, and keep to our proper business of saving souls! Are we thus to convince gainsayers! And extend the triumphs of the Cross! And bring the whole family of Adam into one dear brotherhood!

Let me entreat you to study your Bible. Mark the course which prophets and apostles, with the Savior at their head, pursued. Did they throw the mantle of religion over the chain of servitude and the scourge of oppression? When?

Where? How? That thing they never did. In language, the most pointed and emphatic, they exposed the hypocrisy of those pretenders, who tried to unite the love of God with hatred of man. They applied the edge of the most cutting irony to the fat hearts of such religionists. They levelled their dreadful blows at the king on his throne and the priest at the altar. Wealth, renown, refinement, furnished no shield for the guilty. And were they not intent on the salvation of souls? Yes; indeed they were; *and they employed the only appropriate means.* Who, now, is to occupy the places which their ascent to heaven has left vacant? If the ministers of the gospel refuse to catch their mantle, on whose shoulders shall it fall? If the pulpit may not be employed in exposing and rebuking popular iniquity, what is it good for? Shall we leave the guilty to work out their own reformation, while we, — *keep ourselves to the business of saving souls!*

Look again, my brother, to those models, to which every christian minister is bound to conform himself. Did they take the side of the oppressor against the oppressed? Did they court the rich and despise the poor? Did they look on unmoved while the strong crushed the weak. Never. Of the victims of popular prejudice and violence they were the friends and advocates; and this at the hazard of reputation and of life. When did they refuse "to consider the poor?" to raise up the down-trodden? Were they not "eyes to the blind and feet were they not to the lame?" The cause which they knew not, were they not forward and thorough to search out? Did not our Savior appropriate the Gospel especially to the poor—to the poor, to whom His heart and His arms were ever open? And must we see the poor, driven from the Cross, robbed of the Bible, plundered—not of their "ewe lambs," but of their wives and children, insulted, polluted, murdered with impunity, and keep our hearts and our tongues still? Must we see churches, built up by fraud and filled with adultery, without uttering a syllable! And religious teachers claiming for American slavery the stability and the sanctity of a christian institution! and quoting texts from the Old Testament and the New to justify man-stealing! and spitting their venom in the faces of the friends of human freedom! Must we see all this and much more, and keep as cold and silent as the

grave ! And why ? For the sake of saving souls ! Then let us take the priest on his way to Jericho, for our model. He was, probably, intent on making proselytes. Full of missionary zeal, how could he pause to pity and help the poor sufferer, whom the thieves had left "half dead ?" He could not come down from the work of saving souls to relieve a wounded, bleeding body ! *His piety suffocated his humanity !* and along he stalks "on the other side." Say, my brother, are we to tread in his footsteps ? Certainly we are, if our priestly obligations are inconsistent with "considering the poor !"

My brother, have you tasted the "blessedness" of "considering the poor ?" Do you recognize in them the form and face of your final judge ? Be not deceived. Mistake not sickly sentimentalism for christian principle. Study the description which, in the 25th of Matthew, our Savior gives of the final judgment. What think you of that stranger, hungry, ragged, oppressed, and exhausted by disease, whom He, there, exhibits as His representative ? Can you turn away from his crushed frame and broken heart, under the pretence that this is required by your official obligations ! The ministers of Christ, too much engaged in soul-saving to sympathize with their suffering Lord, to vindicate His rights, to relieve His necessities ! *Hypocrisy, my brother, lurks in every such pretence.* I charge you, affectionately yet solemnly, in the light of "Jesus Christ and him crucified" plead the cause of the oppressed. "Cry aloud and spare not." As thyself in bonds, remember the bound. Enlist the church in the cause of holy freedom. Give heaven and earth no rest till "every yoke is broken and the oppressed are free." Then shall salvation, proceeding from the throne of God and the Lamb, gladden the face of all the earth. "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily, and thy righteousness shall go before thee ; the glory of the Lord shall be thy rereward."

Oneida County, N. Y., June, 1836.

SLAVERY, AND ITS ECCLESIASTICAL DEFENDERS.

BY THE EDITOR:

1. *Slavery*.—By WILLIAM E. CHANNING. Boston: 1835.
2. *Present State of the Slavery Question*.—Art. VII. of the Quarterly Christian Spectator. New-Haven, March, 1836.
3. *Slavery*.—Art. VI. of the Biblical Repertory and Theological Review. Princeton: April, 1836.

THE two latter of the articles above, are in review of the first. We have grouped them here, not intending a critical notice of the whole, for our remarks will be chiefly confined to the last.

Among the clerical opposers of active measures for the abolition of slavery, there are two classes. The one is composed of the more liberal, enlightened, benevolent minds, who adopt into their creed the fundamental principles of human rights, and *theoretically* recognize their bearing upon the evil in question; but when they come to the practical application, fall into violent fits of "worldly wisdom." The ingenuity which they manifest in fencing and fettering their principles, so as to prevent any efficient action, till such time as slavery shall please to abolish itself, is really worthy of a better cause. They have the most exalted conceptions of the power of truth, but seem to despise all vulgar and physical means, and extended arrangements, for bringing it to act upon the public mind. To this class belongs Dr. Channing, and it argues some advancement in the character of the *Christian Spectator* to say the same of his reviewer in that periodical.

The other class, sadly numerous, cut out their principles to suit their latitude, always taking care to say nothing which shall clip a handbreadth from the full eternity of slavery. Their writings furnish by far the best defence for the determined slaveholder, which his bad cause admits. It must not for a moment be supposed that these men are lax or heterodox in their religion. On the other hand, they are the very champions of a religion of the purest sort,—altogether exalted above any questionable admixture with natural sympathy, or vulgar good works. In their religious character,

they may well be said to live separate from the world and above it, for they will not come down from the height of their sanctity to rebuke any sin that is connected with *politics*, nor turn aside from their straight course to "Jericho," to look after the stranger that has fallen among thieves. We shall see in the sequel, whether the reviewer of the Biblical Repertory has any claims to be put in this class.

At this late hour, it is quite unnecessary for us to dwell on the excellencies or errors of Dr. Channing's book. So far as the right and wrong of slavery are concerned, he has merely repeated, evidently without harm to the style or language, arguments already familiar in the mouths of abolitionists. But for Dr. Channing to say such things, was, nevertheless, as beneficial to our cause, as if they had been his own discoveries. To many, our doctrines in the mouth of Dr. Channing will be the highest dictates of political wisdom, while from our own, they would be regarded as the wildest ravings of fanaticism. But the Dr. dislikes our measures, our combination, our agitation, our unsparing denunciation of slaveholders. *He* has proved them to be the worst species of robbers, but thinks it a great blunder to *call* them so. He dislikes our war-cry of "*immediate emancipation*." According to his wisdom, the slaves should not a moment longer be held as goods and chattels by their masters; but then, as there are doubts about their fitness for freedom, they should not be made immediately free—they should pass through a state of *slavery to the "community,"* on their way to the enjoyment of their inalienable rights! He professes to honor the motives of the abolitionists, but takes it upon him, with great solemnity, to deliver a homily for their benefit, on the importance of uniting *honesty* and *charity* with zeal, of pursuing a good end by *right* means, intimating that if we have the right kind of zeal, "we shall not find in the greatness of an enterprise an apology for *intrigue* or for *violence*." He earnestly desires the abolitionists to lay aside their "public agitation," disband their "affiliated societies," and seek their end "by wiser and milder means." The abolitionists, after receiving such a piece of advice, certainly have a right to expect of the learned Dr., to be told what those wiser and milder means are, and to be told explicitly. But instead of this, they are treated to a page or two of exceedingly loose reasoning, or

rather declamation, about "individual action." "I fear," says Dr. Channing, "that the native, noble-minded enthusiast often loses that single heartedness, which is his greatest power, when once he strives to avail himself of the machinery of associations." And yet he had said, but a breath before, that there are cases to which the system of agitation by associations is adapted. Shall not the reformer avail himself of such means in *these* cases? And pray what are they? On this question the Dr. has not seen proper to enlighten us. In truth, to our feeble comprehension, his whole disquisition on this subject is totally unintelligible. We can hardly help fancying, that the distinguished author has got this prejudice against extensive agitation and combined forces in some of his famous theological wars, in which, being immensely outnumbered by his adversaries, he has conceived a fondness for the Bobadilian way of disposing of them, and would now transfer it to the subject of slavery. His way may be very courageous, but to us, so far as we understand it, it seems altogether visionary, and quite the reverse of nature and common sense. Has he any considerable examples of its efficacy, in the good old times when it flourished so, to set before us?

But Dr. Channing professes to base his condemnation of the agitation system on facts. He says, "The adoption of the common system of agitation by the abolitionists, has proved signally unsuccessful. From the beginning, it created alarm in the considerate, and strengthened the sympathies of the free states with the slaveholder. It made converts of a few individuals, but alienated multitudes. Its influence at the South has been evil without mixture. It has stirred up bitter passions, and a fierce fanaticism, which have shut every ear, and every heart against its arguments and persuasions. These effects are the more to be deplored, because the chance of freedom to the slave lies chiefly in the dispositions of his master. The abolitionist proposed, indeed, to convert the slaveholders; and for this end he approached them with vituperation, and exhausted on them the vocabulary of abuse! And he has reaped as he sowed. His vehement pleadings for the slave have been answered by wilder ones from the slaveholder; and what is worse, deliberate defences of slavery have been sent forth, in the spirit of the dark ages, and in defiance of the moral convic-

"tions and feelings of the christian and civilized world. "Thus, with good purposes, nothing seems to have been "gained. Perhaps (though I am anxious to repel the thought,) "something has been lost to the cause of freedom and hu- "manity."

On this text the Christian Spectator offers several pages of commentary, "illustrating the recent history, and present "bearings of the Slavery question in this country," commencing as follows:—"What Dr. Channing says, is, for "the most part, truly said, and well said; yet in some points "it is far from being the whole truth."

"The system of agitation pursued by the abolitionists, "has strengthened the sympathies of the free states with "the slaveholder.' True; yet this increased sympathy "with slaveholders is not produced by the system of agita- "tion alone. It is by their schemes of agitation, taken in "connection with their doctrine of *immediate* freedom, "and their usurpation and perversion of the name of aboli- "tionist, that the anti-slavery societies have produced in the "free states so considerable a re-action in favor of slavery. "Dr. Channing finds himself compelled, by the persecutions "and the mobs which have been got up against these socie- "ties, to take sides with a party whose doctrine of immediate "emancipation he renounces, whose system of agitation he "deprecates, and whose spirit of denunciation he abhors. "Just so thousands of the best of men (!) struck with the "ferocity of the denunciations, indiscriminately launched "against all slaveholders, in all possible circumstances, *have "been constrained to take sides with slaveholders*, and to "say, Whatever may be true of slavery, slaveholding is not "necessarily so bad as you represent it. Those who have "demurred at the new doctrine of immediate emancipation, "or its corollaries,—such as the exclusion of every slave- "owner from all christian communion, have been vilified in "the publications of these reformers as 'dough-faces,' 'pro- "slavery advocates,' 'apologists for oppression and man- "stealing;' and by suffering the same reproaches with the "slaveholder, from the same quarter, *have been compelled "thus far to sympathize with him*. The name of aboli- "tionist, which justly belongs, as a name of honor, to all "those states which have provided for the extinction of "slavery within their own territory, and to every citizen of

“those states who approves and honors such a policy, has
“been perverted and degraded by being claimed as the dis-
“tinctive name of a bitter, contentious, and therefore,
“obnoxious party ; till many who once would have gloried
“in such a name, and who, when it shall have regained its
“legitimate meaning, will glory in it again, having lost their
“sympathy with the name, have *unconsciously* become *less*
“*interested in the thing*. Under such influences, it is not
“strange that there has been a temporary re-action in the
“public sentiment of the free states ; nor is it strange that
“political editors, and others, at the North, presuming on the
“force and permanency of this re-action, and having an ob-
“ject to gain, have even ventured to defend the whole theory
“and practice of slavery and the slave trade, as they exist
“in the southern states.”

That the *aristocracy* of the free states, from their intimacy with which Dr. Channing and his reviewer judge, and grossly mis-judge, the feelings of the people of those states, do sympathize with the slaveholders, is a sad truth, of which we have been for some time aware ; but that this sympathy has originated among the “best of men,” in the way and manner described by the learned reviewer, admits, at least, of a doubt. Very excellent men ! and worthy abolitionists ! who, the moment a small party arose, and demanded that abolition should be “immediate,” forsook their colors, and fled to the enemy ! Most noble-hearted and christian advocates of abolition ! who, being caught by the immediatists at the Lord’s table with slaveholders, and being thereupon called “apologists for oppression and man-stealing,” &c. &c., immediately *began* to sympathize with slaveholders ! Why, pray, what were these “best of men” doing, all the time they were enjoying this “christian communion” with slaveholders at the Lord’s table, but *sympathizing* with them ? Suppose our revolutionary fathers had caught some of their fellow-citizens returning from a feast at the enemy’s camp, and had applied to them the usual epithet of the day ; they might have replied with the logic of our reviewer,—Ah, the fault is your own ; you call us *Tories*, and that drives us to *sympathize* with the British ! Such a storm of denunciation and rebuke, it is true, has been launched at slavery, that it is no wonder that all at the North, who wish its continuance, should be frightened and driven to *manifest* their sympathy ;

but it is passing strange that those to whom the precious cause of abolition was so dear, that they only feared the immediatists would harm it, should be driven to such a course. But, after all, how can it be true, that the sympathies of the free states have been at all driven over to the slaveholder, when you shall not meet a man in a million, not even among the profligate editors of the most virulent anti-abolition papers, who will not tell you *he is as much opposed to slavery as you are*? Let the Christian Spectator answer it. In the mean time, for our own part, we are satisfied with the answer to be gathered from the very paragraph we have extracted. In that very paragraph, there beams out a sympathy for the slaveholder, clear as the sun at noon; but we happen to know that this sympathy is of as long standing as the periodical itself, and that it is much weaker and more restrained by right principle now than it used to be. In this very paragraph, there is a strong desire expressed to recover the name of "abolitionist," and yet the Christian Spectator surely must have taken to itself a good share of those epithets wherewith the "reformers" have "vilified" "the best of men." Here, then, see the fruit of this vilification. The Christian Spectator sympathizes more with the slave, less with the slaveholder, than it used to. In this very article, it swallows, whole, doctrines advanced by Channing, against which it stoutly rebelled when they were uttered, a few years ago, by Garrison. Why, it stands up a living monument of the falsehood of its own assertion, and the absurdity of its own philosophy. We should like to see the man who will admit that he thinks better of southern slavery now than he did five years ago.

Intelligent abolitionists have smiled at the simple ignorance of the great Dr. Channing, when he talks about the system of agitation having "proved signally unsuccessful." The Dr. truly, must have had, magnificent ideas of success, and we wonder in what cause they were ever realized, if, indeed, he had any knowledge whatever of the abolition excitement. But every intelligent observer of human nature must be still more astonished that a distinguished divine could draw the shallow inference from the wrath and bitterness excited at the South by the abolition agitation at the North, that it had "shut every ear and every heart against its arguments." True, it had shut every *mouth*, but is the

mouth inseparably connected with the "ear and the heart?" The pro-slavery leaders at the South view the matter differently; they have not hesitated to declare that slavery is endangered by the secret operation of the arguments of the agitators upon the *hearts* of slaveholders. Equally superficial is the inference, that the cause of freedom may be retarded by defences of slavery, sent forth in the spirit of the dark ages. But whatever may be the result of such defences, and of the wrath of the South, the Christian Spectator seems determined that the abolitionists shall not have the sole credit of having called them forth. "Others," says the reviewer, "who discussed the subject of slavery before the modern doctrine of immediate emancipation was broached, before the present system of agitation was dreamed of, found, as Dr. Channing has found since the publication of this book, that it is not the doctrine of immediate abolition only, nor the scheme of northern agitation only, nor a fierce denunciatory temper only, nor the combination of all these things only, that is odious at the South; but that every discussion of slavery, in whatever quarter, and whatever form; every proposal for the abolition of slavery, whatever the spirit in which it may be conceived, and whatever the arguments by which it may be enforced, is sure, if only it attracts the attention of the South, to be met by a growl of fanatical defiance." Very true. Hence, we have argued that a certain pretended scheme of abolition, which has been received with favor in some quarters at the South, has really no tendency towards abolition, and would have been opposed no where at the South, had it every where been as well understood as by those who received it.

But we are reminded by this last extract of the Reviewer in the Biblical Repertory. He begins by a pathetic lamentation on this very subject. Most mournfully does he bewail the palmy days of by-gone hypocrisy, when slavery "was spoken of in the slaveholding states as a *sad inheritance*, fixed upon them by the cupidity of the mother-country, in spite of their repeated remonstrances," when the sentiments of Jefferson could be, and were, repeated in his own native state, when the subject was openly discussed in the legislature of Virginia, (as it would be again if the Southampton affair should be repeated), when Kentucky failed only by a

minority of one vote, to call a convention to amend her constitution in regard to slavery *and* other subjects, when two northern states instructed their Senators in Congress to vote for abolition in the District of Columbia; and when the inhabitants of the District itself petitioned for its abolition, "How altered," exclaims the reviewer, "is the present state of the country! Instead of lamentations and acknowledgements, we hear from the South the strongest language of justification. And at the North, opposition to the proceedings of the anti-slavery societies, seems to be rapidly producing a public feeling in favor of slavery itself." So we should think, were we to judge the North by this thoroughly pro-slavery review in the Biblical Repertory. But what have we lost by losing those hypocritical lamentations, which had no reference to repentance and restitution? What have we lost by losing that apathy at the North, under which half a dozen Quakers could get out of any legislature whatever resolutions about abolition in the District they pleased? What have we lost by the rapid development of pro-slavery feeling among the aristocrats of the sea-board, who pocket half the profits of cotton? We have gained by all. The sage of the Christian Spectator half suspects this, and is rather jealous of our glory, while the sorrowful inditer of the Repertory, charges it upon us as a sad mischief. With great comfort we leave these theologians to settle the controversy among themselves. The one asserts that every proposal of abolition, though in the best *spirit*, has been sure to be met at the South "with a growl of fanatical defiance." The other says, that, "under ordinary circumstances, such arguments as those presented on this subject by Dr. Wayland's Elements of Moral Science, and in Dr. Channing's recent publication, *would have been received with respect and kindness in every part of the country.*" And he bases this upon another assertion, that "the same sentiments, *more offensively*, and *less ably urged*, have hitherto been thus received."

Out of the abundance of his charity and knowledge of the matter, the Princeton reviewer characterizes the anti-slavery publications as made up, for the most part, of denunciation, vituperation, passionate appeals, and "gross exaggeration of the moral and physical condition of the slaves." He involves even those whose individual course he considers

unexceptionable, in the same condemnation, because they have made "*common cause*" with the most reckless declaimers." We wish, by the way, this honest verdict of unguarded common sense to be noted, for we shall have occasion to use it by and by. "The wildest ravings of the Liberator," continues the reviewer, "have been constantly lauded; agents have been commissioned, whose great distinction was a talent for eloquent vituperation; coincidence of opinion as to the single point of immediate emancipation, has been sufficient to unite men of the most discordant character." We do not feel ourselves called upon to go into a defence of the anti-slavery publications against charges so utterly unsustained. Persons who are not as ignorant of those publications, as is probably the reviewer himself, will smile at the brazen assurance with which he copies the senseless slang of the newspaper press. This pious reviewer would doubtless have his elaborate article pass for a very dignified, philosophical, and christian production, totally unlike the "ravings" of those graceless moral Bedlamites, the immediate abolitionists. Well, it is unlike, and the difference is this. The abolitionists, when they charge an opponent, and they not seldom have occasion to do it, with gross exaggeration, reckless declamation, raving, eloquent vituperation, &c., take care to submit something in the shape of *proof*. They refer to the statements, or the language employed; they do not bring into court an indictment of most damnatory counts, and leave it there to prove itself. If they charge an opponent with falsehood, or, as we are sorry to say the case may be, in plain Saxon, with *lying*, they honestly undertake to show wherein he has *lied*; or if with "raving," they show that he has made incredible assertions, without attempting to sustain them. As to the charge of uniting "men of the most discordant character," we have not a word to say, only, that if the abolitionists have discovered a moral cement of so powerful a nature, it might be well for our reviewer to borrow a little of it for the use of the Presbyterian Church, of which we suppose he is a member. There is nothing like a great principle of practical eternal truth to unite discordant elements, and many professedly christian churches, for want of such a principle, come together only to quarrel.

After thus setting forth the character of the anti-slavery

publications, the Reviewer proceeds to show how deluded are the abolitionists in imitating, which he takes it for granted they do, "their predecessors in England," in "a course of measures, which, though rational under one set of circumstances, is the height of infatuation under another." We suppose, on a similar principle, that, with the prophet-killers of Judea, all the prophets were "*rational*" men, and worthy of everlasting remembrance, except those who happened at that time to speak the truth, and *to be alive*, who were terribly infatuated and mistaken men ! The difference of circumstances, which works so total a change as to the propriety of the means in the two cases, is simply this : in the one case, an Imperial Parliament had absolute power of legislation over slavery in the colonies, and in the other, Congress has no more power to legislate upon slavery in the *States*, than it has in Russia. Truly, this reviewer may reckon forgetfulness one of the best of his logical faculties, for the strength of his argument depends upon his forgetting the District of Columbia. Over slavery in that District, Congress, though much disposed so to do, has never dared to deny its full constitutional power to legislate. Now, the single object of the abolition of slavery in that ten miles square, is sufficient to warrant all the agitation that the abolitionists have ever practised or proposed. The thing is practicable, and may be carried without a single slaveholding vote. Here, then, we have a perfect parallel with the case of Great Britain, only the slaves are not so numerous, the interests involved in the immediate issue not so great, and of course the enterprise less difficult. But whether more or less difficult, the thing depends solely as it did in Great Britain, on a change in the national sentiment ; and till the reviewer can prove that like causes do not produce like effects, he must admit us to be "*rational*" in imitating our "predecessors in England," and deriving encouragement from their success.

But supposing that British abolition had depended altogether upon the Colonial Assemblies, and not at all upon Parliament, and supposing that the District of Columbia were not concerned in the question, we are still prepared to contend, that the system pursued by the British abolitionists, and their American "*imitators*," would be the only and sure road to abolition. What is the problem ? To persuade

the planter to yield up to the government on the one hand, and to the laborer on the other, the power and the rights that he has taken away. Now, in view of the overgrown pride and power of the system of slavery, it is perfectly obvious to remark, that simple argument, or appeal to the conscience of slaveholders, while other circumstances remain as they are, will not effect the object. If abolitionists hoped any such thing, their folly might well deserve the holy sneers of pro-slavery theological reviewers. They know the heart of the tiger too well to hope to deliver the kid from his paw, either by simply reasoning the matter, or by rushing with force and arms to the rescue. But tigers perhaps may be, and men certainly can be, brought under the power of circumstances. Let us take the case of the West Indies, and suppose that abolition had constitutionally lain only in the power of the colonial legislatures. It is not probable that the home agitation of the abolitionists, would have produced a higher state of exasperation in the colonies than it actually did; for the thought that their darling lust lay at the mercy of Parliament, was the most goading of all, and their determination was, if possible, to frighten Parliament from action. The change of public sentiment would have proceeded to an abhorrence of slavery much more intense than was actually excited. The planters would soon have found that there was no such thing as comfort in spending the avails of unrecompensed toil in the mother country. Their extreme unpopularity, and the strong drift of the abolition current would have soon sent out heirs of slave property, or fresh adventurers, resolved to introduce or to advocate the experiment of free labor. These experimenters would have been sustained against pro-slavery influence, and cheered on by the sympathy of the whole nation. In a little time, the tide of colonial wrath would have rolled backward, before the all-powerful force of interest, popularity, circumstances. It would have become altogether *expedient* to do right.

It may be said that the case would be different in South Carolina. The chivalry of that gallant land of *freemen* would never, in the tide of time, suffer an abolition experimentalist, or a repentant slaveholder, to set his foot on her *chainless* soil. Never would it brook the relentings of an office-secking "patriarch," or the longings of a Doctor of

Divinity for a foothold in a northern or British pulpit. It may be said, that her summer ramblers, in their flight from the rice swamps; would stop short at the sulphur springs of Virginia, lest they should catch abolitionism from the waters of Saratoga. But we can suppose no such thing, without losing sight of the laws of mind. The chivalry, fire, fury, and pistols; the McDuffie-eternal-slavery manifestos, the lynchings, mail robberies, and incendiary publication bills of South Carolina, all belong to the first act of the abolition drama. They are played off, while the hero of the piece is in poverty and disguise, and none but the slaveholders know his power. When abolition becomes enthroned in the hearts of more than half the nation, and reigns as it does now in Britain, every slaveholder will find himself placed in a new set of circumstances, he will find himself full of new feelings; he will not be the same man. Let the North be regenerated on the subject of human rights, and the whole South would at once change her policy. She would beg us to say nothing about Calhoun's bill, or the dissolution of the union. She would again profess to be very sorry for the unfortunate relation in which she finds herself placed to the slave population—but now she would have to open her doors to the actual introduction of a new system of labor.

The abolitionists "have produced," says the reviewer, "a state of alarming exasperation at the South, injurious to the slave, and dangerous to the country, while they have failed to enlist the feelings of the North." No doubt of the exasperation, for which the abolitionists are as much to blame as is the judicious physician for the insurrection in the human system, consequent upon a good dose of ipecac; but we should like to ask the reviewer, how he *knows* that this exasperation *has been* "injurious to the slave?" Whose testimony has he taken? Is it to be believed, that when the slaveholder picks up a number of the Emancipator, or Liberator, and finds himself written down a tyrant, a flogger and starver of men, women, and children, if any thing like that can be found in those papers, he thereupon goes to his overseer, and orders him to double the lashes, and diminish the meal? that he goes about immediately to verify the charges which he indignantly pronounces to be utterly false? It is quite easy and natural for slaveholders to say,

that all foreign interference *will be* injurious to the slave, but if one should assert, that, in any ordinary case, slaves have been treated worse on account of the abolition excitement, he should be put under oath, and if he continued to assert it, he would be, *ipso facto*, convicted of perjury; for, that a man should act contrary to every conceivable motive, is altogether incredible. 'But,' we imagine the reviewer to ask with great astonishment, 'have not the slaveholders, 'in consequence of your measures, taken away the religious and literary privileges of the slaves?' No. And for the simple reason, that the slaves had none to be taken away. It is a mockery to call the opportunities for instruction, religious or literary, that have been enjoyed by American slaves, *privileges!* Privileges, forsooth! Just as it is a privilege for a dog to lick the crumbs beneath a table, where, for every infinitesimal fragment, he is nearly sure to get a tremendous kick. Our soul is sick of the everlasting hypocrisy of this nation. We maintain, that, so far as the slaves have any true religion, it is not in consequence of instruction, but in spite of it. No instruction of any sort has been granted them, but such as it was supposed might be made subservient to slavery, for there is a sort of slave-piety, which has its price in the market. Where does the slaves' preacher feed and lodge, and by whose sovereign pleasure does he minister? Why, at the "big house," and his master is the slaves' master—the christian despot, who holds his fellow men under the laws of superlative robbery. And how much of the gospel does he preach? Enough to save the soul, he will tell us. Truth says, enough to prop the authority of the master. Grant that there has been enough of this sort of preaching to pillow the sleepy consciences of all the South, and that, by the abolition excitement, the whole has been swept away; who shall weep for it? The crocodiles. For our part, we rejoice, as we do at the sweeping away of all sorts of hypocrisy. The very fact that these "privileges" have been taken away by the master, shows that they were always under the power of the master, and were not honestly meant for the good of the slave.

Again, our reviewer greatly over-estimates the importance of southern exasperation, when he pronounces it "dangerous to the country." Where is the proof? Is it in the

projected southern convention of last summer, which was given up, lest by the untoward obstinacy of the North, it should place the South under the *necessity* of receding from the Union? Is it in the projected gag laws? That danger comes purely from slavery itself. So long as slavery exists, truly there is danger,—danger, if we speak, that the slaveholders will *attempt* to gag us openly; if we are silent, that they will chain us secretly. The balance of safety certainly lies in southern exasperation.

To the charge that abolitionists “have failed to enlist the feelings of the North,” we fear they must plead guilty. They might have done more, they ought to have done vastly more. While their cause has been onward, and every effort to “enlist the feelings of the North” has been blessed with large success, they have not half felt the importance of the cause, they have not half sympathized with those in bonds, as bound with them. Moving at a snail’s pace, they have been half inclined to believe the outcry of their opposers, “you are going too fast.” We hope abolitionists will awake at the reproof the enemy, and no longer do things by the halves.

But the “common sense of the public has been shocked “by the incongruity and folly of hoping to effect the abolition of slavery in one country, by addressing the people of “another.” It had little reason to be shocked, and ought certainly to have considered that the people of the “other country,” some of them are actually slaveholders, hundreds of them are constantly emigrating to become slaveholders, thousands of them are the parents, or brothers, or sisters of slaveholders, the great body of them are the customers of slaveholders, are clothed in the cotton, fed with the rice, and sweetened with the sugar of slavery. “We do not expect,” says the reviewer, very gravely, “to abolish despotism in “Russia, by getting up indignation meetings in New York.” No. Satan cannot expect to abolish sin; nor the inmates of a brothel, licentiousness; nor slaveholding republicans, despotism. But provided slavery were abolished at home, and the despotism of Russia should begin to be patronized and participated in by our aristocracy, and pronounced innocent by our clergy and theological reviewers, and should be lauded and commended to our imitation by hordes of well-dressed Russian travellers, in our stages and steamboats, our

taverns and watering places, then, in our humble opinion, it might not be either incongruous or foolish to get up "indignation meetings in New-York." Thus much, by the way of small talk.

We come now to the reviewer's grand argument, whereby the abolitionists are despatched scientifically and theologically.

As we cannot quote a dozen pages, we shall endeavor faithfully, but briefly, to state the argument in our own words. *Slavery existed in Judea, Greece, and Rome, in its worst form. Christ and his apostles every where came in contact with it, yet they never condemned it, although they did condemn injustice and oppression. Slaveholders were recognized and received into communion as christians by the apostles, and the relative duties of masters and slaves were taught, without any hint that the relation was to be dissolved. Hence, slaveholding itself cannot be a crime, and ought not to be condemned as such.*

The reviewer's conclusion is quite the reverse of that arrived at, or rather started from, by the common apologists. They admit that slaveholding in the abstract, apart from its circumstances, is totally sinful, but when put in practice, woven into *society*, and shielded by laws, it becomes right—eternally right, *for the present*. With the reviewer, on the other hand, it is right in the abstract—in a sort of negative nakedness, or nothingness of being; but, *as it actually exists*, he gives it over to utter condemnation, under the name of *abuses*. Let it not be supposed, however, that he does this openly or honestly. Not at all; but when pressed with the cruel practices, the wicked laws, the horrible results, he flies off, exclaiming, 'Oh! these are wrong to be sure, but then they are not necessarily any part of slavery itself.' This is the hole at which he is perpetually creeping out. We demand of the reviewer to be told, plainly, what is necessary to slavery itself. And what answer do we get? Why, he puts us off with the following beautifully indefinite and exquisitely slippery definition. "*All the ideas which necessarily enter into the definition of slavery, are deprivation of personal liberty, obligation of service at the discretion of another, and the transferable character of the authority and claim of service of the master.*" Now, this definition is good for nothing at all,

but to play Jesuitical tricks with. Suppose we were to take it as a faithful and distinctive description of American slavery, and proceed to denounce that outrageous oppression as in all circumstances sinful, and call for its immediate abolition. The reviewer would cry out against us, as involving the innocent with the guilty. And would say, 'Your doctrine would go to release apprentices from their masters, and children from their parents. For neither children, nor apprentices, enjoy personal liberty, they both are under obligation to serve at the discretion of others, and, under some circumstances, authority over them, and claim to their services, may be transferred.' There is, in fact, another very important idea, which enters into the definition of slavery as it exists, and as it is pronounced, in all circumstances, sinful by the abolitionists. It is the idea of absolute ownership, on the part of the master, of the whole man, body and soul. The master does not merely lay a claim to service. He is not the owner of mere service. He does not transfer a mere claim to service. Such phraseology implies that there is something reserved to the ownership of the slave; something given to him by the law, or by custom, or never taken from him. It implies that his children are his; for children are not service. It implies that he is, in some sense, and to some extent, the trustee of his own rights. It is trifling with facts to say, that this property in service is a full account of American slavery. The masters do not understand it so. Call in question their rights, they will tell you promptly, our slaves are as much our property as our horses. The slaves do not understand it so. 'Whose slave are you?' asks the traveller. 'I am Massa Calhoun's slave, at your service, Massa.' 'And whose slave are you?' 'Oh! I belong to de church,—I am de property ob de congregation, Massa.' Now, the idea which, more than any other, lies at the foundation of that slavery, with which abolitionists wage war, is that of *absolute ownership of the person*, an ownership precisely on the footing with that which the law allows to be exercised, and which is exercised over *brutes*. It will be objected, that such ownership is limited, because the law steps in and protects the life of the slave, and even his limbs; because it holds him to a certain extent amenable for crime, and consequently is obliged to treat him on some occasions as a

person. The limitation is rather nominal than real. The interference of the law to protect from cruelty the lives and limbs of beasts, curtails the power of the owner, but it certainly does not change the claim of absolute ownership into one of mere service, and the reason is, that it vests no right in the beast, it leaves it wholly in the hands of its owner, to be used solely for his benefit. Why do slaveholders object to every law designed to promote the benefit of the slave? Because they conceive such law goes to impair their right of property in him. No interest of the slave is protected, or can be protected, under the existing institution, except so far as this is the consequence of laws for the protection of the community, or the security of slave property itself. And, as the laws are, the protection of the slave is a mere farce, no restraint being laid upon the master which it is not perfectly easy for him to evade.

Again, when viewed in relation to that species of servitude which is "recognized" in the New Testament, our reviewer's definition of slavery is altogether inappropriate and delusive, though it was doubtless framed with reference to it. It was evidently intended to blind the mind to the distinction between the New Testament servitude, and that which exists in our day. To fit it to the general character of the former, it is made to contain no element which "*necessarily*" involves a violation of human rights, while, to fit it to the latter, it contains elements which practically involve the violation of all right. Now, neither the reviewer, nor any other Biblical critic, dares say that the words translated *servant* and *service* in the New Testament, have a less extensive signification in Greek than in English. To translate them by the words *slave* and *slavery*, is to beg the whole question. Slavery, true enough, may be thus exalted, but the Bible is degraded, for its figures, descriptive of a willing and cheerful obedience to God, are no longer derived from the voluntary labor, of cheerful and well-paid domestics, but from the unwilling and thankless drudgery of slaves. The holy John, and the zealous Paul, and the courageous Peter, are no longer the "*servants* of Jesus Christ," but the "*slaves* of Jesus Christ." Would the theologians of Princeton turn their Savior into a slaveholder? Do they find any thing so lovely in the beau ideal of a southern slaveholder, with his hundred negroes, that they would make the relation

of the latter to the former, the type of their's to their Divine Lord and Master? We trust not.

The reviewer has in a note given us Paley's definition of slavery, viz.: "An obligation to labor for the benefit of the master, without the contract or consent of the servant." This comes nearer to American slavery—so near, indeed, that it departs widely from the servitude of the New Testament. Even the pro-slavery commentators all agree that *one* of the ways in which persons became slaves (servants) among the Jews was by contract, and before he can quote New Testament servitude to any purpose, it remains for the reviewer to prove that that was *not* the only way. If persons either could be, or were, *forced* into servitude among the Jews and kept in it by fear, as is universally the case in regard to American slaves, it is for him to show why the condition of a "*servant*" was accounted more honorable than that of a "hired servant," as appears from the 15th chapter of Luke. It would seem that "servants" were often members of families on the same footing with the children, differing from them in nothing except the inheritance. (See Gal. iv. 1.) "Many years have I *served* thee" says the brother of the prodigal to his father. We read also of a servant who owed ten thousand talents to his Lord, from which we must certainly infer that servants could hold property, and of course that they were not "necessarily" the property of their masters. Much more must we infer this, from the fact that the punishment for the insolvency of this debtor was, that he should be *sold*, and his wife and children and all that he had, and *payment* should be made. To use the very appropriate illustration of our eloquent friend, George Thompson, would a man *sell* his own horse out of his own stable, for the crime of eating up a sack of beans that was not intended for him? What would he gain by it? Just as much as the debtor's lord would, on the supposition that his servant, the debtor, was already his property.

Now, one of the main positions of the reviewer, is, that in the days of Christ and his Apostles, slavery existed in Judea, Greece, and Rome, worse than that of the present day. Where is his proof that such slavery existed in Judea? We know that a species of servitude did exist there, under the denomination *δουλεία*, which lacked the odious characteristics of American bondage, which was just and honorable

both to master and servant. Now, if a worse species of servitude did exist, it is for the reviewer to show it. If this servitude was abused by tyranny on the part of the master, so as to be worse than American slavery, it is for him to show it. If he cannot show it, it will be easy for us to show why Christ did not condemn it. If he can show it, we turn his battering ram upon his own castle. He says to us, the fact that slavery existed, in its worst form, in Judea, and Christ did not condemn it, is proof that slavery *in itself* is not a sin, but the sin lies in the abuse. We say, then, that the fact that slavery was *abused* in Judea, and Christ did not pronounce that *abuse* a sin, is proof that it is no sin. Hence, not only is the tree good but the fruit also. The reviewer may take which course he pleases. But let us remind him that the evidence that the Savior did not rebuke any particular sin, is altogether negative. For aught we know, the Savior may have made innumerable applications of the principles of his sermon on the mount, which are not recorded. The evangelists did not take notes of his whole ministry, much less report the whole in four short tracts.

But, for the sake of the argument, let us admit that the Savior and his apostles found slavery existing, and did not meddle with it. The circumstances were totally different. Who were the slaveholders? They were either the Jewish aristocracy, the "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," who had made void the law by their traditions, and overset the whole foundation of morals; or they were heathen idolaters, among whose abominations slaveholding by no means stood prominent. None of them acknowledged any principles of Divine or human right, which might be appealed to against slavery. There was no fund of moral power stored up in an already evangelized community. There were no *north-ern states* as a foothold. The first thing every where to be done was to establish the fear of the true God, and overthrow the worship of the false, before Christ and his apostles could make a specific and direct attack upon slavery, with the least propriety, or hope of success. On the other hand, who are the slaveholders with us? They are not Jews, nor heathen idolaters. They profess to know and love the true God and Jesus Christ. They are not only christians, but republicans, with the declaration of equal rights on their lips. And here, joined hand in hand

with these slaveholders, are the christians of the North, half a continent full of them, whose missionary flag floats over every sea, who promise that they will give to every family on the globe a bible in its own language—and they can do it. Here is the stillness of their Sabbaths; here are their sanctuary spires on every hill and valley; here are their battle grounds, with the fiery hosts of intemperance, and there are the living trophies, snatched from the burnings of hell; here are their camp-meetings, and protracted meetings, and glorious revivals; here are their schools, and colleges, and theological seminaries; and here are their concerts of prayer for the conversion of the whole world. Who shall say that christianity is not triumphant here, that she is not established here, in full freedom and power? And does our theological reviewer, deeply read in church history, see nothing different in this state of things from that which surrounded the Man of Nazareth, with his fishermen of Galilee? from that which confined christianity to an upper chamber? from that which saw the whole body of the christian church scattered, like the thistle-down, upon the four winds of persecution?

But, did not Christ and his apostles do something more than merely *not* condemn slavery? Did they not receive slaveholders to their communion? Such is the assumption of the reviewer. But he has contented himself with the assumption, without the trouble of examining “scriptural passages.” Now, that there were believing *masters* in the communion of saints, we have no disposition to deny. But the question is, were they *slaveholders*? The reviewer cannot make them such, even by his own deceitful definition of slavery, without doing violence to the sacred text. The very gate, by which masters entered the church, had written over it, “*Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal,*”—(Col. iv. 1.),—an injunction which would be perfectly nugatory if it left the servant no voice in the bargain, nor any rights as a man.* It is all the abolitionists now ask of the slaveholder, that he obey this command, in doing which he will cease to be a slaveholder, and become the master of voluntary servants, standing, so far as

* We forewarn the hair-splitters, that we do not include children and minors, nor nullify their filial and quasi-filial obligations.

rights are concerned, on a footing of equality with himself. Again, the apostle, in the very passage where he speaks of believing masters, contrasts the servants who were under those masters, with those who were under the *yoke*. It is unfortunate that the English translation fails to give us the distinction which is obvious to every reader of the original. After enjoining upon the ὅσοι εἰσὶν ὑπὸ ζυγῶν δαδλοῖ, (*Whatsoever servants are under the yoke*), that they should count their own masters worthy of all honor, that *the name of God and [his] doctrine be not blasphemed*, the sacred writer turns to another class; οἱ δὲ πιστοὺς ἔχοντες δεσπότας—(*BUT those who have believing masters*). The fair inference from the *distinctive* employed is, that the latter were *not* under the *yoke*. And this inference is confirmed by the injunction, which the apostle proceeds to lay upon them, μὴ καταφρονεῖτωσαν, ὅτι ἀδελφοί εἰσιν, (let them not disregard them—decline their service—because they [the masters] are brethren;) [See Matt. vi. 24], ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δουλεύετωσαν, (but serve them the more willingly,) ὅτι πιστοὶ εἰσὶ καὶ ἀγαπῆτοί, οἱ τῆς ἐνεργείας ἀντιλαμβάνμενοι.* (because they are

* This word; in our humble opinion, has been so unfairly used by the commentators, that we feel constrained to take its part [ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι]. Our excellent translators, in rendering the clause "partakers of the benefit," evidently lost sight of the component preposition, which expresses the *opposition of reciprocity*; rather than the *connection of participation*. They have given it exactly the sense of μεταλαμβάνειν, (2 Tim. ii. 6). Had the apostle intended such a sense, he would have used the latter verb, or one of the more common words, μέτοχοι, κοινωνοῦντες, &c. (See Heb. iii. 1, and 1 Tim. v. 22, where the latter verb is used in the clause, "neither be partaker of other men's sins." Had the verb in our text been used, it might have been rendered, "neither be the *part-taker* of other men's sins.") The primary sense of ἀντιλαμβάνω is *to take in return—to take instead of, &c.* Hence, in the middle with the genitive, it signifies *to assist*, or *do one's part towards* the person or thing expressed by that genitive. In this sense only is the word used in the New Testament.—(See Luke, i. 54, and Acts xx. 35). If this be true, the word ἐνεργεσία cannot signify the benefit conferred by the gospel, as our common version would make it, but the *well-doing* of the servants, who should continue to serve their believing masters, while they were no longer under any *yoke* of compulsion. This word is used elsewhere in the New Testament but once, (Acts iv. 3.) in relation to the '*good deed*' done to the impotent man. The plain import of the clause, unmystified by the commentators, is, that believing masters would not fail to *do their part towards*, or encourage by suitable returns, the *free* service of those who had once been under their *yoke*. Dr. Doddridge remarks, that Mr. Cradock proposed to translate it, *who will be careful to recompense the well doing of their servants*;—"but I think," says the Dr., "ἐνεργεσία signifies a *benefit freely conferred*, and, therefore, is hardly fit to express even the cheerful and exact obedience of *slaves*."—A *begging of the question*, worthy of the fattest logical mendicant: ever honored with a semi-lunar fur-

worthy of confidence and love, assisting in [doing their part in] this well-doing.) Now, supposing for a moment that these servants of believing masters were still under the *yoke*, why should the apostle address them at all, except to correct a supposition which they might naturally be supposed to entertain, that their masters, as believers, had no longer any authority to enforce the *yoke*?—*Does* the apostle correct such a supposition? Does he confirm the master's claim? Not a word like it. He does not say, Do not despise—do not throw off the yoke of—your believing masters, *because* they have the *right*, or the *authority*, or the *power* to compel service—to enforce the *yoke*;—but, *because* they are worthy of trust and love, they have no disposition to enforce any yoke whatever, except that of mutual kindness.—Do not throw off the yoke, because there is no yoke! The theological reviewers must relieve their supposition of this difficulty, before they can be allowed to use it for admitting slaveholders into the church. Till they have done so, we maintain, that the injunction of the apostle, with the reason assigned, implies, that all servants of *believing masters* were in fact FREE; and that the injunction was delivered only for the benefit of the servant and the honor of christianity, and not at all to enforce any claim or yoke of the master.* The abolitionists, indeed, would now give precisely the same

dels " and yet it would have availed the learned commentator nothing at all, if he had taken the trouble to ascertain the meaning of the next word! Alas! that the good Dr. Doddridge was neither the first nor the last in this folly.

* It would have been a work of supererogation in the apostle to command obedience to the slave, after having acknowledged the master's right to *compel* such obedience. The masters would have taken good care of the matter, if their authority had been conceded. It was precisely because it was generally and well understood *not* to be conceded, but to be fundamentally denied and taken away by the very first principles of the Gospel, that the apostle stepped forward, and enjoined *duties* upon the slaves—duties pre-supposing *rights*—duties founded upon other and higher grounds than the will or the interests of a fellow mortal. Poole quotes one of the old commentators, as saying,—“*Leges civiles nihil præcipiebant servis, quia domini satis eos coercerebant facere quod ex usu dominorum esset. Nunc cum per Evangelium domini facti essent multo leniores, præcepta etiam servis danda fuere.*”—[The civil laws gave no precepts to slaves, because their masters could compel them to do what it was the custom of masters to require. Now, when by the Gospel the masters had become much milder, precepts were to be given even to slaves.] If there is any force in this, the masters must have become milder in the precise point of having lost the power to compel.

advice to the slaves of a truly repentant slaveholder ;—‘Do
‘not leave your master’s employment, because he has now
‘acknowledged your brotherhood, but serve him the more
‘willingly ; for the very fact that he has set you free against
‘his own interests, proves that you cannot have a more faith-
‘ful employer, or better friend.’

From what we have said above, it must not be understood that we admit, that even the *servants who were under the yoke*, stood “necessarily” in the same relation to their masters as every American slave does to his “owner.” This is what the pro-slavery theologians have never proved, and never will. That the yoke was often cruelly and tyrannically enforced, there is no reason to doubt, but it has not been shown that it was the yoke of a brute, nor that it made a man and his children forever articles of merchandise. The yoke of Grecian and Roman slavery, was the yoke of *conquered men*—wickedly conquered, and unjustly held, it may be—but still held as *men*. With the exception of the poor Helots, who were, as Dr. Channing would have American slaves, the slaves of the “community,” the law afforded them the means of regaining their freedom. Within certain limits, they had the right of property ; a portion of their time was their own, and the avails of it were sacredly guarded. This was true, not only in theory, but in practice, for in the days of the apostles, men who had freed themselves from bondage, were to be found among the wealthiest inhabitants of almost every Grecian and Roman city. Many of them flourished not only in wealth, but in arts and letters. Hence, however cruel or despotic might be the sway of slaveholders in that day, slavery then lacked, at least, *one* horrid feature which characterizes it with us—*it was not remediless*. And for this reason, there is the more need that christianity should now step forth to the rescue—*the slaves cannot help themselves !*

Such then was slavery “in its worst forms” in the days of the apostles ; and where is the reviewer’s evidence, biblical or historical, that slaveholders, who still enforced the “*yoke*,” were admitted by them to the christian communion ? This is the vital point of the whole question. For, if the apostles did *not* admit slaveholders into their communion, not even those who held men under the milder* “yoke” of

* Milder, as the reviewer would say, “in itself”—milder in the abstract.

Grecian or Roman bondage, then were the circumstances in which they stood to the slavery of their day, altogether different from those in which the professed church of Christ now stands to the brutal system of American slavery. If the primitive church was pure from the stain, if her converts, on entering her pale, passed in as *brethren*, if servants continued with their masters solely from affection, and masters reciprocated and aided their well doing, and took care to allow them their just and equal rights, then there was no need of a more direct and specific attack on slavery than they made in proclaiming the general doctrines of the cross. "Repent and be converted," was a thunderbolt to the slaveholder, which he well knew, in the light of Christian example, must shiver the "yoke" of his slave. But how is it with the church of our days? We speak now of the great body of professing christians in the United States of America. Why, this church may utter language, which, in the mouths of Christ and his apostles, cut oppressors to the heart, she may preach faith in the crucified, and repentance of all sin, and yet be the nursing mother of slavery. She has the monster in her arms. She is herself a slaveholder! Hence the vital importance to the reviewer's argument, of having slaveholders—actual slaveholders—in the communion of the apostolic church. For reasons which may be suspected before we get through, he chose to *assume the fact*, and then throw upon the abolitionists (page 276) the burden of proving that the circumstances of the Savior and his immediate followers were different from ours!

Well, we shall take up the burden. Leaving totally out of view the difference between a handful of christians battling with the combined hosts of hypocritical Judaism and heathenish idolatry, and striving to introduce the first principles of the fear of God into the world, and the present moral power of enlightened christendom, we shall leave the matter to the verdict of common sense on the single difference between a non-slaveholding and a slaveholding church.

Our blessed Savior was not a slaveholder, nor the son of a slaveholder, but of a carpenter. He honored manual labor, upon which slaveholders throw all manner of contempt, by laboring with his own hands. His immediate disciples were not slaveholders; they did not send their *servants* to catch

fish, or to prepare a room where their company might eat the passover. None of the multitude who believed on the day of Pentecost could have continued to hold slaves, for they had all things common. We read that they sold houses and lands, and laid the price at the apostles' feet, but it is not probable that they did the same by any slaves they might have possessed, although it would be difficult to say why they might not innocently have done so, if slaveholding in itself is right. We have nowhere in the Acts of the Apostles, or their numerous epistles, any intimation, except the one we have already examined, and perhaps another in the epistle to Philemon, that any persons were in the communion of the church who ever had been slaveholders. Now, if slaveholders had been admitted to the communion, with the authority still to maintain their old relation to their slaves, it is hardly possible that great abuses would not have grown out of it,—for even our reviewer does not deny that the system, with all its essential goodness, was liable to, and was then actually loaded with frightful *abuses*. Christian slaveholders, influenced by a worldly spirit, would have been betrayed into unjustifiable cruelty towards those over whom the apostles recognized their supreme authority, they would have been constantly overstepping the bounds of brotherhood in their exactions of service, and would have incurred, in consequence, the apostolic rebuke. If it were not so, christian slaveholding must have been a vastly more manageable thing than it is now a days. But we hear not a word of such rebuke. Among “the care of all the churches,” we do not learn that Paul had any trouble with slaveholders in the church. On the other hand, if slaveholders were excluded from the communion, we should not expect it to be mentioned as any thing remarkable, or which perceptibly increased the odium of the Gospel. Slaveholders would not naturally feel very ambitious to obtain the communion of a company of the *lower class* of people, headed by a parcel of Galilean fishermen, bearing as their banner the ignominious gallows, on which it was the custom to punish SLAVES. When they found the very champions of this new religion courting the poor rather than the rich, not hesitating, or counting it any hardship to minister to the necessities of themselves and others with their *own hands*, when they saw them every where reviled, robbed, stoned, and

beaten like slaves, *with the forty stripes save one*,—in short, when they saw them “lynched,” and submitting to it patiently, it is not at all probable that they would have deigned to think of communing with them till deeply humbled by the grace of God. It is not a very rational supposition, that any slaveholder would have thought of joining such a church and still remaining the lord of his vassals. It is even not irrational to suppose that hundreds of slaveholders may have been converted and admitted to the church—giving liberty to the slaves under their “yoke,”—without even questioning whether the gospel required it. What! join the common people’s church, the laborer’s church, the *slave’s* church, and still be the *holder* of slaves? If Paul met slavery any where, he probably did in Corinth, yet he commenced his course there as a *tent-maker*. He thus naturally gained the sympathy and confidence of the laboring class, and among the rest, of the *slaves*, many of whom doubtless were his hearers, and some his converts, (1 Cor. vii. 21.) And there may have been slaveholders, too, among his converts. It is plain that the latter could not have expected to come into communion with converted slaves, while they held any power which was not just and righteous in the view of slaves, in other words, while they exacted labor by force. But if, contrary to their expectations, they had been so permitted to come in, it would have been the occasion of greatly increasing the difficulties into which that church afterwards fell, and it would every where have shut the door of the apostle as a preacher to laboring people and slaves. Suppose some wealthy Corinthian had been admitted to the church by the tent-making apostle, who still held a plantation outside the walls, with a hundred slaves,—very kindly treated of course, under an overseer. He and his good lady, with the hospitality of slaveholders, would naturally send to the house of the humble Aquila an invitation, which, when translated into modern style, might read like this:—
‘To the REV. PAUL TENTMAKER, D. D.—Dear Sir,—We are surprised and ashamed to learn that you have been so long obliged to subject yourself to a laborious and servile occupation, for the furtherance of the Gospel in our city, and we now hasten to make amends so far as it is in our power. We most earnestly invite you to make our house your home; our carriage and *servants* will always be at

your command, and we shall take the highest pleasure in *seeing* that every thing is done, as it should be, for your comfort and convenience. (Signed) MR. and MRS. DEMAS.* Paul and his humble fellow-tent-makers, Aquila and Priscilla, would have been somewhat surprised, and the latter, perhaps, might not have felt themselves very highly complimented, but we leave it to the reader to judge whether Paul would have been likely to accept the offer. Many a Rev. Doctor of Divinity has accepted such an offer in our day, and some have even more directly depended on slave labor for a support,* which reminds us that our zealous Corinthian converts might have added the following postscript :—‘P.S. We have about thirty *servants*, whom we have been under the necessity of hiring out as a job-gang, for some years past, and we propose now to *give them to the church*, on condition that their *wages* shall be used from year to year to support the ministry of the Gospel.’ What would Paul, and Aquila, and Priscilla have said to this generous offer? On what ground could the church have declined to receive the gift, if slaveholding in itself is right, and if they had already admitted this slaveholder to their communion?

But enough, we cheerfully leave it to common sense, whether it is not an outrage upon the memory of the apostles, as left to us in the New Testament, to say that they either admitted slaveholders to their communion, or gave the slightest encouragement to them in any of their habits or arrangements. Paul once restored a fugitive, it is said. Yes, and in the letter he wrote to his master, he says, he *might have enjoined*, as a matter of *right*, what, from his confidence in that master, he only besought as a favor, viz. : that he would receive this fugitive “not now as a *servant*, but above a servant, a brother beloved—both in the *flesh* and in the Lord.” Slaveholders in the church! and in the days of Paul!! and while every christian stood in peril of a *slave’s* death!!! Such a thing could no more have entered the minds of the primitive christians, than it does into ours, that there will be slaveholders in heaven. Pray, which of the martyrs was a slaveholder? For our part, we have a fancy that a man who can deprive another of his liberty, oblige him to work against his will, and claim the right to sell for money the chance of committing similar outrages,—

* Paxton’s Letters; page 11.

the things which our reviewer says, "*necessarily* enter into the definition of slavery,"—has no relish for martyrdom. We can hardly believe a man who could do such things would, if permitted, join any church but "the synagogue of Satan,"—at any rate, whatever church he did join would be in danger of becoming such.

Such are some of the considerations which satisfy our mind, that the primitive church was pure from any participation in slavery. And hence we are able to see how, by virtue of her doctrine of immediate repentance of all sin, she speedily subverted slavery throughout the then known world. Wherever she went, slavery shared the fate of other more prominent sins. So long as she kept burning the pure light of a holy example, there was no need of a distinct anti-slavery effort.

But what do we see when we look at the American church? Do we see a pure communion? a holy example, which makes the very words *justice, righteousness, mercy*, on the lips of her preachers, so many daggers to the consciences of slaveholders? If we did, then would the American church be in the same circumstances with the Apostolic, and it might be the duty of abolitionists to pursue in regard to slavery precisely the course which Christ and his immediate followers did. The case is sadly reversed. Of this we need go no further for proof than to the corrupt, cruel, loathsome article which is the subject of our remarks. The Presbyterian is one of the largest denominations in America, it claims to embrace the better sort of people—to stand on the top of society—it takes not a little pride in the strictness and purity of its doctrines, and the *spirituality* of its *piety*. At the late meeting of its highest "judicatory," this very article was re-published in a separate form by some of its members, and distributed, as is understood, with the full approbation of the great body of them. We have not a doubt, that if the vote were taken to-day, it would receive the approbation of a vast majority of all the professing christians in the United States. And yet, what is it but an immoral, hypocritical, profligate attempt to justify the most enormous wrong that was ever done by man to man—an argument by which every species of iniquity may be sanctified and brought into common use—a more deadly stab at the vitals of true religion than was ever given by Hume,

Voltaire, or Thomas Paine! The writer of this review knows very well, as indeed the whole universe does, that the slaves were first *stolen from Africa*; by "christian brokers in the trade of blood," to gratify their foul lust of gain. He knows that they are held here, and reproduced into hopeless bondage, as mere brutes, that their masters may live in luxury and idleness. He knows that the very tenure by which they are held, extinguishes every human right, and makes them the mere machines of an *owner*. He knows that all kind treatment, regard for "marital rights," or right of property,* which is based upon American slavery, is as futile as figures traced upon the sea-beach—the scratch of a pin may change the *ownership* in a night, and the morning sun may see the slave stripped of his temporary manhood, and turned out to herd with beasts. He knows that religious instruction on the part of the slaveholders and *their* ministers, is, and is not unfrequently considered by the slaves to be, sheer hypocrisy. All this the reviewer knows, and yet he says that this system is not an *evil in itself*, that it is not necessarily sinful to deprive men of their natural rights, that slavery is analagous to government, to the family relation, &c., that slavery does not degrade the slave from his rank as a human being, that the domestic slave-trade is a mere transfer of a claim to service, and is to be justified in the same way as the transfer of subjects from one government to another.† And he moreover says, the slaves are not any the more absolutely property, because their children are not theirs. Oh no! this only arises out of the fact, that men are *not born with equal rights*.—In

* That there is a great deal of sincere kindness of masters towards their slaves, and that this kindness produces a great deal of happiness, no abolitionist feels disposed to deny, any more than to deny the gratitude which is called out in return, and which is the only available safeguard against insurrection. But this does not make it right to hold men exposed to the dreadful reverse.

† This acute reviewer cites the case of part of Saxony transferred to Prussia, Belgium to Holland, and Louisiana to the United States, in none of which cases, he says, were the people consulted. We suppose he has no eyes to see the difference between a landlord's selling his estate, subject to all the leases, and a landlord setting up his tenants at auction, in lots to suit the purchasers. With him, France did essentially the same thing in transferring the sovereignty, that she would have done in chaining the whole population of Louisiana into coffles, and marching them from their homes, to the crack of the whip, and the music of Yankee Doodle, to be sold forever and aye, as pickers of hops, and builders of stone fence in Massachusetts! But now that we have caught our slimy theologian,—he is not here,—he has slipped out of our hand, by saying, Oh! the chains and the driving, the whips and the fiddles, do not "necessarily" enter into the slave trade!

England, for instance, one is "born a peer, another a commoner ; in Russia, one is born a noble, another a serf ; here, "one is born a *free* citizen, another a disfranchised outcast " (the free colored man), and a third a *slave*. These forms "of society, as before remarked, are not necessarily, or in "themselves, either just or unjust ; but become the one or "the other according to circumstances." Before the discovery of the great "rhetorical flourish," one would have set down the babbler of such dogmatical impudence as a straggler from the dominions of the "holy alliance," or, at any rate, a man born in America by mistake.

And after having exalted slavery to the side of civil and family government, of both which it is directly subversive ; after having confounded Satan's institution for the gratification of avarice and lust, with God's institutions for the counteraction of these foul passions ; after having yielded to the slaveholder all he asks, the reviewer has the assurance to come out and tell us *he is not in favor of slavery*. Oh no ! he wishes "the extinction of slavery, and the *amelioration* of those laws," as sincerely as the abolitionists ! Now, what do we think of a man who labors night and day to build a fort, and when it is completed, and the guns all mounted and manned, comes down among the besiegers and says, I am as desirous to take this fort as you are : the only question is about the "proper method." I maintain it can never be taken by throwing bomb-shells and red-hot shot into it, and a general system of battering the walls : we must first get into it, and spike the guns before we can take it ! What do we say, but that he is a cunning fellow, and means to defend by artifice what he is afraid cannot be saved otherwise ? In this anti-slavery part of his argument, the reviewer in one breath gravely deals out admonitions to such slaveholders, or others, as refuse "proper compensation" to laborers—"If" such a set of men exists ; in another, he tells us that there are few slaveholding countries in which the slave's right to accumulate property is not "practically acknowledged, since we hear so frequently of slaves purchasing their freedom." How bitter and hard-hearted the mockery ! He tells us, too, that "it is very common for a "certain moderate task* to be assigned as a day's work,

* The reviewer here subjoins, in a note, that Dr. Wisner, on his return from a long visit to the South, stated the usual task of the slave, in South Carolina

“which may be regarded as the compensation rendered by the slave for his support. The residue of the day is at his own disposal, and may be employed for his own profit.” But he never informs us, that in this bargain of a daily task on the one part, for a “support” of a *weekly peck of meal* on the other, the slave is not permitted to open his mouth! He never informs us that this “residue of the day,” together with the *Sabbath* itself, must be devoted by the slave to unremitting toil, or himself and his naked little ones will lack the very necessities of life. And again, he solemnly admonishes those slaveholders “*if there are any such,*” who break up families, and refuse to teach their slaves the will of God—as if it was no crime at all to hold men slaves under laws which constantly expose them to the disruption of all family ties, and to be compelled to violate the will of God! Such is a sample of the depravity and hypocrisy which the Presbyterian General Assembly welcomes to the support of a darling lust, in which it deeply and practically participates. And this general Assembly is a fair sample of the great body of the American church!

God forbid that we should say there is nothing good in any one of the great religious denominations in our country! We feel assured that the salt of the earth is in them; but we are equally sure that as bodies they are too corrupt to do any thing else by their natural action on the subject of slavery than to hasten the General putrefaction. To do any good, the salt must concentrate itself. The friends of human rights must unite and organize themselves for the reformation both of the church and the world. It is the

and Georgia, to be about *the third* of a day's work for a northern laborer. According to this, a northern laborer will cut in a day three cords of fire-wood, split three hundred rails, or dig *an acre and a half* of potatoes.—(See Quarterly, A. S. Mag. No. 1. page 95.) Doubtless a southern slave does less than a northern laborer, and one reason is, he is not so well fed. “Meat, when given,” says R. J. Turnbull, Esq., planter of S. C., “is only by way of indulgence and favor.” If any body wonders why the sharp-sighted southerners should be so thrifless as to get half day's works for the want of a little meat, let them understand that *starvelings* are *more easily managed* than stout men, well fed on bacon. It is easy to rule a man, if you can have the key of his *stomach*. But Dr. Wisner made other discoveries besides that which the reviewer is careful to quote. Among the abominations with which his soul was sickened, he related to a friend of ours, that he saw on one occasion, an old, gray-headed, toothless man, brought out before the tavern where he stopped, placed upon a stand, and cried up to the highest bidder, while the gentlemen buyers amused themselves with making him open his mouth to show his *teeth*, and other unfeeling, brutal jokes upon his person.

height of absurdity to suppose that a sin which has flourished for two hundred years under a given action of a given church, shall be abolished by a continuance of the same action of the same church. Our reply to the remedy which the reviewer, with so much professional consequence proposes, is, that *it has been tried for two hundred years, and been found to aggravate the disease.*

Finally, what by a fair analogy, may we think would have been the course of Christ and his apostles if placed in our circumstances. They stand on the soil of Christian America, with hearts all alive to that cause of human salvation which has now been battling with the hosts of hell for eighteen hundred years. That monstrous system of idolatry which once frowned against them on every side, is prostrate. Licentiousness lurks in the dark corners. The Anti Christian beast is wounded in the head. But slavery sways its iron sceptre over the land, scoffing at all law, human and divine, making merchandise of millions of souls for whom Christ died. It is now the prominent evil, the sin of sins, the very Prætorian cohort of Satan. And the visible church itself is in the sad predicament which we have been able but faintly to describe. Now in these circumstances what course would the Savior and his faithful apostles pursue? Would they not wage war with the prominent evil of this day as they did with that of their own? Would they deal any more softly or delicately with it because it has nestled in the church; because it counts among its patrons, many of the 'holiest and best of men?' Would they spare the devourers of widows' houses, because they make long prayers? We think not. Our reviewer himself, in demolishing the miserable argument which Wayland and Channing have borrowed from the sage Paley, has so exactly described the course which we conceive the pioneers of Christianity would pursue in the present state of the church and the world, that we quote him a length. "Let us, however, consider the force of the argument as stated above. It amounts to this. Christ and his apostles thought slaveholding a great crime, but they abstained from saying so for fear of the consequences. The very statement of the argument, in its naked form, is its refutation. These holy men did not refrain from condemning sin from a regard to consequences. They did not hesitate

"to array against the religion which they taught, the strong-
 "est passions of men. Nor did they content themselves
 "with denying the general principles of evil ; they con-
 "demned its special manifestations. They did not simply
 "forbid intemperate sensual indulgence, and leave it to their
 "hearers to decide what did and what did not come under
 "that name. They declared that no fornicator, no adulte-
 "rer, no drunkard* could be admitted into the kingdom of
 "heaven. They did not hesitate, even when a little band,
 "a hundred and twenty souls, to place themselves in direct
 "and irreconcilable opposition to the whole polity, *civil* and
 "religious, of the Jewish state. It will hardly be main-
 "tained that slavery was, at that time, more intimately in-
 "terwoven with the institutions of society, than idolatry
 "was. It entered into the arrangements of every family,
 "of every city and province, and of the whole Roman em-
 "pire. The emperor was Pontifex Maximus ; every depart-
 "ment of the state, civil and military, was pervaded by it.
 "It was so united with the fabric of the government, that it
 "could not be removed without effecting a revolution in all
 "its parts. The apostles knew this. They knew that to
 "denounce polytheism, was to array against them the
 "whole power of the state. Their divine Master had dis-
 "tinctly apprized them of the result. He told them that it
 "would set the father against the son, and the son against
 "the father ; the mother against the daughter, and the daugh-
 "ter against the mother, and that a man's enemies should
 "be those of his own household. He said that he came not
 "to bring peace, but a sword, and that such would be the
 "opposition to his followers, that whosoever killed them,
 "would think he did God service. Yet in view of these
 "certain consequences, the apostles did denounce idolatry,
 "not merely in principle, but by name. The result was
 "precisely what Christ had foretold. The Romans, tolerant
 "of every other religion, bent the whole force of their wis-
 "dom and arms to extirpate Christianity. The scenes of
 "bloodshed which century after century followed the intro-
 "duction of the Gospel, did not induce the followers of
 "Christ to keep back, or modify the truth. They adhered
 "to their declaration that idolatry was a heinous crime.

* The reviewer seems to have omitted the "*no extortioner*" (ἀπαξ, the word
 which probably corresponds more nearly to our modern term slaveholder, than
 any other in the Greek language,) lest it should spoil his argument !

“And they were right. We expect similar conduct of our missionaries. We do not expect them to refrain from denouncing the institutions of the heathen as sinful, because they are popular, or intimately interwoven with society. The Jesuits, who adopted this plan, forfeited the confidence of Christendom, without making converts of the heathen.”

For this eloquent passage, we thank the pro-slavery reviewer, and commend it to the special attention of all those who, without any reference to the right or wrong of slavery, condemn the whole course of the abolitionists, as totally unphilosophical, and ill adapted to the removal of *any* evil—we commend it to all those who have a holy horror of all denunciation, and of every thing which may occasion disunion in church or state. And moreover, we maintain that it describes the very course in which every christian—every man—yes, every man, woman, and child, ought immediately to embark, inasmuch as SLAVERY is the IDOLATRY of this nation. Yes, let them embark in it, and hold on to it, though it should occasion strife in every family, though it should shatter every church, though it should sunder the nation, though it should pour out the blood of martyrs in the streets of every city and village, and scatter their ashes on every wind. *The proclaimers of eternal, changeless truth are not responsible for the mischief of wicked men in opposing it.* It is to the proclamation of that truth, fearless of consequences, that we owe all the glorious things that we this day possess over and above the lot of naked and brutal savages, trembling before the blood-thirsty priests of Woden and Thor. And to the like proclamation of that truth, we must owe our deliverance from that righteous and terrible *turn of the tables*, to which the Almighty God ever dooms the proud oppressors of the poor.

THE LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF A FUGITIVE SLAVE.

SLAVERY in the United States: A narrative of the life and adventures of Charles Ball, a black man, who lived forty years in Maryland, South Carolina, and Georgia, as a slave, under various masters, and was one year in the navy with Commodore Barney, during the late war. Containing an account of the manners and usages of the planters and slaveholders of the South, a description of the condition and treatment of the slaves, with observations upon the state of morals amongst the cotton planters, and the perils and sufferings of a fugitive slave, who twice escaped from the cotton country. Lewistown, Pa. Printed and published by JOHN W. SHUGERT, 1836. 12mo. pp. 400.

It has sometimes been made a question whether more truth can be communicated in real or fictitious narrative. The latter, certainly, has the advantage of selecting from a wider field of incident, and though its facts may none of them have ever actually occurred, yet they may be more strictly analogous to the great body of those which do actually occur, than the events in the life of almost any one individual. Sometimes, however, an individual is found whose history, unaided by fiction, correctly illustrates the history of his class. Through the well written life of such an individual, we can look in upon the character, condition and habits of his class with as much clearness and confidence as through a window. The fictitious narrative may afford us a view of the same objects, equally distinct and vivid, but after all it is only a mirror, and may leave upon the mind a doubt whether it has not practiced some distortion as well as reflection upon the direct rays of truth. Whether the narrative, whose very prolix title we have placed above, is real or fictitious, we think its reader will not retain, through many pages, a doubt of the perfect accuracy of its picture of slavery. If it is a mirror, it is of the very best plate glass, in which objects appear so clear and "natural" that the beholder is perpetually mistaking it for an open window without any glass at all. We are led to this remark, not because we feel ourselves at liberty to doubt the genuineness and reality of the whole, but because the book itself does not answer a number of preliminary questions which the public will not fail to ask.

Of the plan of the work we cannot give the reader a better idea than by quoting from its preface.

"The narrative is taken from the mouth of the adventurer himself; and if the copy does not contain the iden-

“tical words of the original, the sense and import, at least, are faithfully preserved.

“Many of his opinions have been cautiously omitted, or carefully suppressed, as being of no value to the reader; and his sentiments upon the subject of slavery have not been embodied in this work. The design of the writer, who is no more than the recorder of facts detailed to him by another, has been to render the narrative as simple; and the style of the story as plain, as the laws of the language would permit. To introduce the reader, as it were, to a view of the cotton fields, and exhibit, not to his imagination, but to his very eyes, the mode of life to which the slaves on the southern plantations must conform, has been the primary object of the compiler.

“The book has been written without fear or prejudice, and no opinions have been consulted in its composition. The sole view of the writer has been to make the citizens of the United States acquainted with each other, and to give a faithful portrait of the manners, usages, and customs of the southern people, so far as those manners, usages, and customs have fallen under the observation of a common negro slave, endued by nature with a tolerable portion of intellectual capacity. The more reliance is to be placed upon his relations of those things that he saw in the southern country, when it is recollected that he had been born and brought up in a part of the state of Maryland, in which, of all others, the spirit of the ‘old aristocracy,’ as it has not unaptly been called, retained much of its pristine vigor in his youth; and where he had an early opportunity of seeing many of the most respectable, best educated, and most enlightened families of both Maryland and Virginia.”

It is due to the writer to say, and perhaps a higher compliment could not be paid him, that he has accomplished his very important and difficult object, in a manner that would have done credit to the author of Robinson Crusoe. He has traced his hero through all the vicissitudes of slavery, with a minuteness of detail that is truly astonishing, while at the same time the interest of his narrative is ever fresh and growing. The book is not merely readable. It has charm and potency about it. It is one of those books which always draws the reader on by the irresistible magnetism of

the next paragraph to the unwelcome appearance of "The end." It may be supposed that we speak as a partizan; however this may be, the book is not a partizan book. Though it comments with just severity upon some of the atrocities of slavery, it broaches no theory in regard to it, nor proposes any mode or time of emancipation. While it does not strive to palliate or conceal any of the dark things, it fairly displays those flashes of sunbeam, which are sometimes called the bright side of slavery, but which are in reality only the kindly workings of human nature, bursting out in spite of slavery. We rejoice in the book the more, because it is not a partizan work. An abolitionist, if he were to be sent through the southern states, with safe conduct, and full power to investigate, would, of course, be so much alive to the bitter evils of slavery, that he would be apt to search them out and note them down, to the exclusion of those alleviating ingredients, with which God's blessed constitution of things always strives to sweeten the cup of human woe. On the other hand, an anti-abolitionist, whose theory binds him to set down to *the credit of slavery* every particle of happiness, or even common comfort, of which he may find the slave possessed, would be filled so full with the discovery of good fruit, that he would find no time or disposition to look beneath the surface, into the working of that iron machinery of motive, which, for the most part, animates the system of southern labor. Our narrator has much better satisfied the demands of truth, by exhibiting both the inside and the out,—by showing the worm at the root of the tree, and the consequently diseased and rotting condition of the trunk; and the green leaves which nevertheless continue to adorn and comfort its branches. There is a common sense consistency in his whole picture, which shows us a giant sin battling against the impregnable bulwarks of God's plan; it is not the creation of an over-enthusiastic brain, in which we see God dishonored by the complete triumph of that sin.

Charles Ball, for the writer has made him speak in the first person, after tracing his parentage, and giving a variety of interesting facts connected with his early history in Maryland, in due time sets out, by the kindness of his Maryland master; upon the great southern anti-liberty pilgrimage, leaving behind him a wife and four

children. The outset and order of march he thus describes :—

“My purchaser ordered me to cross my hands behind, which were quickly bound with a strong cord; and he then told me that we must set out that very day for the South. I asked if I could not be permitted to go to see my wife and children, or if this could not be permitted, if they might not have leave to come to see me; but was told that I would be able to get another wife in Georgia.

“My new master, whose name I did not hear, took me that same day across the Patuxent, where I joined fifty-one other slaves, whom he had bought in Maryland. Thirty-two of these were men, and nineteen were women. The women were merely tied together with a rope, about the size of a bed-cord, which was tied like a halter around the neck of each; but the men, of whom I was the stoutest and strongest, were very differently caparisoned. A strong iron collar was closely fitted by means of a padlock round each of our necks. A chain of iron about a hundred feet in length was passed through the hasp of each padlock, except at the two ends, where the hasps of the padlocks passed through a link of the chain. In addition to this, we were handcuffed in pairs, with iron staples and bolts, with a chain about a foot long, uniting the handcuffs and their wearers in pairs. In this manner we were chained alternately by the right and left hand; and the poor man to whom I was thus ironed, wept like an infant when the blacksmith, with his heavy hammer, fastened the ends of the bolts that kent the staples from slipping from our arms. For my own part, I felt indifferent to my fate. It appeared to me that the worst had come, and that no change of fortune could harm me.”

He then describes the feelings of a slave when separated from home, and the objects of his affection, to take the chances of a southern market. Some have supposed that the fact that the slave allows himself to be driven away, and soon assumes his wonted composure, is a proof that his social affections are of a shallow and transitory character, fitting him peculiarly for his servile condition. Such philosophers have studied the human heart to very bad purpose. The truth of the matter is most touchingly developed by Charles Ball.

“After we were all chained and handcuffed together, we
“sat down upon the ground ; and here reflecting upon the
“sad reverse of fortune that had so suddenly overtaken me,
“and the dreadful suffering which awaited me, I became
“weary of life, and bitterly execrated the day I was born.
“It seemed I was destined by fate to drink the cup of sorrow
“to the very dregs, and that I should find no respite from
“misery but in the grave. I longed to die, and escape from
“the hands of my tormentors ; but even the wretched privilege
“of destroying myself was denied me ; for I could not
“shake off my chains, nor move a yard without the consent
“of my master. Reflecting in silence upon my forlorn
“condition, I at length concluded, that as things could not
“become worse—and as the life of man is but a continued
“round of changes, they must of necessity, take a turn in
“my favor at some future day. I found relief in this vague
“and indefinite hope, and when we received orders to go on
“board the scow, which was to transport us over the Patux-
“ent, I marched down to the water with a firmness of pur-
“pose, of which I did not believe myself capable, a few
“minutes before.

“We were soon on the south side of the river, and taking
“our line of march, we travelled about five miles that even-
“ing, and stopped for the night at one of those miserable
“public houses, so frequent in the lower parts of Maryland
“and Virginia, called ‘*ordinaries*.’

“Our master ordered a pot of mush to be made for our
“supper ; after despatching which, we all lay down on the
“naked floor to sleep, in our handcuffs and chains. The
“women, my fellow-slaves, lay on one side of the room ;
“and the men, who were chained with me, occupied the
“other. I slept but little this night, which I passed in think-
“ing of my wife and little children, whom I could not hope
“ever to see again. I also thought of my grandfather, and
“of the long nights I had passed with him, listening to his
“narratives of the scenes through which he had passed in
“Africa. I at length fell asleep, but was distressed with pain-
“ful dreams. My wife and children appeared to be weeping
“and lamenting my calamity ; and beseeching and im-
“ploring my master on their knees, not to carry me away
“from them. My little boy came and begged me not to go
“and leave him, and endeavored, as I thought, with his lit-

"the hands to break the fetters that bound me. I awoke in
"agony, and cursed my existence. I could not pray,
"for the measure of my woes seemed to be full, and I
"felt as if there was no mercy in heaven, nor compassion
"on earth, for a man who was born a slave. Day at length
"came, and with the dawn we resumed our journey towards
"the Potomac. As we passed along the road, I saw the slaves
"at work in the corn and tobacco fields. I knew they toiled
"hard, and lacked food ; but they were not, like me, drag-
"ged in chains from their wives, children, and friends. Com-
"pared with me, they were the happiest of mortals. I almost
"envied them their blessed lot."

Not long after this, he shows us how the elasticity of the human mind had done its office for him, by the following paragraph :—

"After leaving James River, I assumed an air of cheer-
"fulness, and even gaiety. I often told stories to my master
"of the manners and customs of the Maryland planters, and
"asked him if the same usages prevailed in Georgia, whither
"we were destined. By repeatedly naming the rivers that
"we came to, and in the order which we had reached them,
"I was able, at my arrival in Georgia, to repeat the name of
"every considerable stream, from the Potomac to the Savan-
"nah, and to tell at what ferries we had crossed them. I
"afterwards found this knowledge of great service to me.
"Indeed, without it, I should never have been able to extri-
"cate myself from slavery."

After carefully examining all parts of his long chain, without finding any flaw which gave the least hope of escape, our traveller, it seems, had accommodated himself to his hard lot, and to relieve the tedium of this *American* mode of travelling, he occupied himself in making observations upon the country through which he passed, and to very good purpose, if we may judge from the graphic descriptions with which his narrative is enlivened. He also compares what he saw of the condition of the slaves, with what he had seen and felt in Maryland, and on this part of his subject does not abstain, as the preface had led us to expect, from a little philosophy upon the top of his facts. Nor do we think the reader will be the loser by it. The testimony which he bears to the kindness of some of his masters and mistresses, is certainly very honorable to them *as slaveholders*.

Of his three masters in Maryland, he says, "After having lived so many years in a state where slavery is not tolerated, I cannot say that either of them (except the last, who sold me to the Georgians, and was an unfeeling man,) used me worse than they had a moral right to do, *regarding me merely as an article of property*, and not entitled to any rights as a man, political or civil. My mistresses in Maryland were all good women." "There are no better hearted women in the world, than the ladies of the ancient families, as they are called, in old Virginia, or the country below the mountains; and the same observations will apply to the ladies of Maryland. The stock of slaves has belonged to the family for several generations, and there is a kind of family pride in being the proprietors of so many human beings, which, in many instances, borders on affection for the people of color." But through the malignant influence of slavery, even this wretched protection of "family pride," comes to very little at last, for just when the "proprietors" come to have the disposition to be generous, they lack the ability. "I am convinced," says our narrator, "that in nine cases out of ten, the hardships and sufferings of the colored population of lower Virginia, are attributable to the *poverty and distress of its owners*. In many instances, an estate scarcely yields enough to feed and clothe the slaves in a comfortable manner, without allowing any thing for the support of the master and family; but it is obvious that the family must first be supported, and the slaves must be content with the surplus,—and this on a poor, old, worn-out tobacco plantation, is often very small, and wholly inadequate to the sustenance of the hands, as they are called. There, in many places, nothing is allowed to the poor negro, but his peck of corn per week, without the sauce of a salt herring, or even a little salt itself."

The following we take to contain not only fact, but sound philosophy, and we wish that those philosophers who assert that slaveholding is not "necessarily" sinful, would well digest it. Here is a little of the "necessary" fruit of the mildest, best, most *Christian* sort of slaveholding.

"Wretched as may be the state of the negroes, in the quarter, that of the master, and his wife, and daughters, is, in many instances, not much more enviable in the old apartments of the *great house*. The sons and daughters

“of the family are gentlemen and ladies by birthright; and
“were the former to be seen at the plough, or the latter at
“the churn or wash-tub, the honor of the family would be
“stained, and the dignity of the house degraded. People
“must, and will be employed about something, and if they
“cannot be usefully occupied, they will most surely engage
“in some pursuits wholly unprofitable. So it happens in
“Virginia—the young men spend their time in riding
“about the country, while they ought to be ploughing or
“harrowing in the corn-fields; and the young women are
“engaged in reading silly books, or visiting their neighbor’s
“houses, instead of attending to the dairy, or manufacturing
“cloth for themselves and their brothers. During all this,
“the father is too often defending himself against attornies,
“or making such terms as he can with the sheriff, for debts,
“in which he has been involved by the vicious idleness of
“his children, and his own want of virtue and courage, to
“break through the evil tyranny of old customs, and com-
“pel his offspring to learn, in early life, to procure their
“subsistence by honest and honorable industry. In this
“state of things, there is not enough for all. Pride forbids
“the sale of the slaves, as long as it is possible to avoid it,
“and their meager allowance of corn is stinted, rather than
“it shall be said, the master was obliged to sell them. Some-
“body must suffer, and self-preservation is the first law of
“nature, says the proverb—hunger must invade either the
“great house or the quarter, and it is but reasonable to sup-
“pose, that so unwelcome an intruder will be expelled, to
“the last moment, from the former. In this conflict of pride
“and folly, against industry and wisdom, the slaveholders
“of Virginia have been unhappily engaged for more than
“fifty years.” Hence the anxiety with which the statesmen
of Virginia watch the fluctuations of the human-flesh mar-
ket. Every rise of a hundred dollars in the price of a slave,
will distribute another million of dollars among these needy
lordlings. The opening of Texas to American slaves, will
probably be worth \$3,000,000 a year to Virginia alone!
Hence, too, the calm resignation of Virginia to the law
which brands the African slave trade as *piracy*. It doubled
the market value of her slaves. In her proud distress, she
accepted the profits of this tariff as a bribe to keep still
about the anti-slavery principle of it.—Call my business

piracy and welcome, said she, if you will only give me the chance of getting the dollars. And the consumer, the poor cotton and cane-planting South, with all its chivalry and nullification, has been obliged to be out of pocket some five or six millions of dollars a year, by this same tariff, *without grumbling*, lest the moral power of the world should be down upon her about the *delicate subject*! She did hope, after such a sacrifice, to be allowed to manage her matters in peace at home. What a pity that the *Free-Trade* politicians of South Carolina, after smothering all their virtuous antipathy to a tariff, and the incorruptible patriots of Virginia, after taking a *bribe*, quietly to permit themselves to be branded *pirates*, should be called upon for still greater concessions! Is it to be wondered that such a call should prove too much for the temper of men, unfortunately, born to rule?

As some of our readers, who have never travelled beyond the Potomac, may have no idea of the unfortunate plight to which the small-fry slaveholders are sometimes reduced, we give a specimen.

"At night we stopped at the house of a poor gentleman, "at least he appeared to wish my master to consider him a "gentleman; and he had no difficulty in establishing his "claim to poverty. He lived at the side of the road, in a "framed house, which had never been plastered within—"the weather boards being the only wall. He had about "fifty acres of land, enclosed by a fence, the remains of a "farm which had once covered two or three hundred acres; "but the cedar bushes had encroached upon all sides, until "the cultivation had been confined to its present limits. "The land was the very picture of sterility, and there was "neither barn nor stable on the place. The owner was "ragged, and his wife and children were in a similar plight, "in point of habiliments. It was with difficulty that we "obtained a bushel of corn, which our master ordered us to "parch at a fire made in the yard, and to eat for our supper. "Even this miserable family possessed *two slaves*, half "starved, half naked wretches, whose appearance bespoke "them famishing with hunger, and victims of the lash."

After being on the road from the first of May to the ninth of June, our author and his companions arrived in the neighborhood of Columbia, South Carolina. Here the negro

driver, or merchant as he was now called, finding a good prospect of sale, halted, and set about recruiting his slaves for their appearance in the market. Their chains had already been filed off on entering the State of South Carolina, on the same principle that a jailer would release his prisoner, after getting him safe within the discipline of Sing Sing or Auburn. The process of disposing of the coffle is detailed with the most painful particularity, and the manners and customs of the whites, as they appeared to a newly imported slave, are most vividly sketched.

It was the lot of our narrator to be purchased by one of the wealthiest planters in that part of the country, the possessor of two hundred and sixty slaves. His plantation, which produced cotton, rice, and indigo, is minutely described, and the management of the slaves is carried still further into detail. We are made to see every thing, from the great parlors of the master, to the old iron pot and wooden spoons in the cabin of the slave; from the long whip of the overseer, to the wooden bucket in which his wife sent him his dinner. And as to the said long South Carolina whip, whose crack has in this our day, struck terror into the hearts of legislators as far north and east as New Hampshire and Maine, it may be well enough to give our author's very lucid description of it.

"The whip used by the overseers on the cotton plantations, is different from all other whips that I have ever seen. The staff is about twenty or twenty-two inches in length, with a large heavy head, which is often loaded with a quarter or half a pound of lead, wrapped in catgut, and securely fastened on, so that nothing but the greatest violence can separate it from the staff. The lash is ten feet long, made of small strips of buckskin, tanned so as to be dry and hard, and plaited carefully and closely together, of the thickness, in the largest part, of a man's little finger, but quite small at each extremity. At the farthest end of this thong, is attached a cracker, nine inches in length, made of strong sewing silk, twisted and knotted, until it feels as firm as the hardest twine. This whip, in an unpractised hand, is a very awkward and inefficient weapon; but the best qualification of the overseer of a cotton plantation, is the ability of using this whip with adroitness; and when wielded by an experienced arm, it is one

“of the keenest instruments of torture, ever invented by the ingenuity of man. The cat-of-nine-tails, used in the British military service, is but a clumsy instrument beside this whip, which has superseded the cow-hide, the hickory, and every other species of lash, on the cotton plantations. The cow-hide and hickory bruise and mangle the flesh of the sufferer; but this whip cuts, when expertly applied, almost as keen as a knife, and never bruises the flesh, nor injures the bones.”

Our hero had the good fortune to make no further than an eyesight acquaintance with this long whip, though he did not escape every other instrument of torture, while he remained upon this plantation. It was not so with many of his companions in labor. On the first evening after his arrival, several were flogged, and among them a woman, who had been brought up delicately in Maryland, and with whom, on account of their common origin, our narrator had loitered too long on their return from the field. She was laid on her face, and received twelve lashes, in a manner too brutal to be described; but he was pardoned, because it was his first offence. The overseer was too prudent not to avail himself of the self-respect of a slave, so long as it could be made to last, consistently with his iron discipline. The young woman who received this, as it would be called, merciful flogging, had a young child, and had attracted the author's attention in the morning, by her not leaving it, like the others, at the end of her row in the shade of the cotton plants, but carrying it on her back, slung in a rude knapsack, whilst she worked with the hoe. When asked the reason of this conduct, she replied, “Indeed, I cannot leave my child in the weeds amongst the snakes. What would be my feelings if I should leave it there, and a scorpion were to bite it? Besides, my child cries so piteously when I leave it alone in the field, that I cannot bear to hear it. Poor thing, I wish we were both in the grave, where all sorrow is forgotten.”—A wish which was soon realized.

We are strongly tempted to give in full the routine of a slave's life on this cotton plantation, but it is not our object to reprint the book. The subject of the religious privileges of the slaves, however, is so little understood, and so grossly misrepresented by the ecclesiastical supporters of slavery, that we cannot abstain from giving in his own language, the

experience of Charles Ball in 1804. It will readily be perceived, that the causes which were in operation then, are in operation now, and are inseparable from slavery itself—or rather, their intensity is in direct proportion to the price of cotton, and they can never cease to operate while the crop is profitable.

“No horn was blown by the overseer to awaken us this (Sabbath) morning, and I slept, in my little loft, until it was quite day; but when I came down, I found our small community a scene of universal bustle and agitation.

“Here it is necessary to make my readers acquainted with the rules of polity, which governed us on a Sunday, (for I now speak of myself, as one of the slaves on this plantation,) and with the causes which gave rise to these rules.

“All over the South, the slaves are discouraged, as much as possible, and by all possible means, from going to any place of religious worship on Sunday. This is to prevent them from associating together, from different estates, and distant parts of the country; and plotting conspiracies and insurrections. On some estates, the overseers are required to prohibit the people from going to meeting, off the plantation, at any time, under the severest penalties. White preachers cannot come upon the plantations, to preach to the people, without first obtaining permission of the master, and afterwards procuring the sanction of the overseer. No slave dare leave the plantation to which he belongs, a single mile, without a written pass from the overseer or master, but by exposing himself to the danger of being taken up and flogged. Any white man who meets a slave off the plantation without a pass, has a right to take him up, and flog him at his discretion. All these causes combined, operate powerfully to keep the slave at home. But in addition to these principles of restraint, it is a rule on every plantation, that no overseer ever departs from, to flog every slave, male or female, that leaves the estate for a single hour, by night or by day—Sunday not excepted—without a written pass.

“The overseer, who should permit the people under his charge, to go about the neighborhood without a pass, would soon lose his character, and no one would employ him; nor would his reputation less certainly suffer, in the estimation of the planters, were he to fall into the practice of

“granting passes, except on the most urgent occasions, and
“for purposes generally specified in the pass.

“A cotton planter has no more idea of permitting his slaves
“to go at will, about the neighborhood on Sunday, than a
“farmer in Pennsylvania has of letting his horses out of his
“fields on that day. Nor would the neighbors be less inclined to complain of the annoyance, in the former, than in
“the latter case.

“There has always been a strong repugnance amongst
“the planters, against their slaves becoming members of
“any religious society. Not as I believe, because they are
“so maliciously disposed towards their people, as to wish to
“deprive them of the comforts of religion—provided the
“principles of religion did not militate against the principles
“of slavery—but they fear, that the slaves, by attending
“meetings, and listening to the preachers, may imbibe with
“the morality they teach, the notions of equality, and liberty, contained in the gospel. This, I have no doubt, is the
“ground of all the dissatisfaction, that the planters express,
“with the itinerant preachers, who have from time to time,
“sought opportunities of instructing the slaves in their religious duties.

“The cotton planters have always, since I knew any thing
“of them, been most careful to prevent the slaves from
“learning to read ; and such is the gross ignorance that prevails, that many of them could not name the four cardinal
“points.

“At the time I first went to Carolina, there were a great
“many African slaves in the country ; and they continued
“to come in for several years afterwards. I became intimately acquainted with some of these men. Many of them
“believed there were several gods, some of whom were good,
“and others evil, and they prayed as much to the latter as
“to the former. I knew several who must have been, from
“what I have since learned, Mahomedans ; though at that
“time I had never heard of the religion of Mahomed.

“There was one man on this plantation, who prayed five
“times every day, always turning his face to the east, when
“in the performance of his devotions.

“There is in general, very little sense of religious obligation, or duty, amongst the slaves on the cotton plantations ;
“and christianity cannot be, with propriety, called the reli-

"gion of these people. They are universally subject to the grossest, and most abject superstition ; and uniformly believe in witchcraft, conjuration, and the agency of evil spirits in the affairs of human life. Far the greater part of them are either natives of Africa, or the descendants of those who have always, from generation to generation, lived in the South, since their ancestors were landed on this continent ; and their superstition, for it does not deserve the name of religion, is no better, nor is it less ferocious than that which oppresses the inhabitants of the wildest regions of Negro-land.

"They have not the slightest religious regard for the Sabbath day ; and their masters make no efforts to impress them with the least respect for this sacred institution. My first Sunday on this plantation, was but a prelude to all that followed ; and I shall here give an account of it.

"At the time I rose this morning, it wanted only about fifteen or twenty minutes of sunrise ; and a large number of the men, as well as some of the women, had already quitted the quarter, and gone about the business of the day. That is, they had gone to work for wages for themselves—in this manner : our overseer had, about two miles off, a field of near twenty acres, planted in cotton, on his own account. He was the owner of this land ; but as he had no slaves, he was obliged to hire people to work it for him, or let it lie waste. He had procured this field to be cleared, as I was told, partly by letting white men make tar and turpentine from the pine wood which grew on it, and partly by hiring slaves to work upon it on Sunday. About twenty of our people went to work for him to-day, for which he gave them fifty cents each. Several of the others, perhaps forty in all, went out through the neighborhood, to work for other planters.

"On every plantation with which I ever had any acquaintance, the people are allowed to make patches, as they are called—that is, gardens, in some remote and unprofitable part of the estate, generally in the woods, in which they plant corn, potatoes, pumpkins, melons, &c., for themselves.

"These patches they must cultivate on Sunday, or let them go uncultivated. I think, that on this estate, there were about thirty of these patches, cleared in the woods,

"and fenced—some with rails, and others with brush—the property of the various families.

"The vegetables that grew in these patches, were always consumed in the families of the owners; and the money that was earned by hiring out, was spent in various ways; sometimes for clothes—sometimes for better food than was allowed by the overseer, and sometimes for rum; but those who drank rum, had to do it by stealth.

"By the time the sun was up an hour, this morning, our quarter was nearly as quiet and clear of inhabitants as it had been at the same period on the previous day.

"As I had nothing to do for myself, I went with Lydia, whose husband was still sick, to help her to work in her patch, which was about a mile and a half from our dwelling. We took with us some bread, and a large bucket of water; and worked all day. She had onions, cabbages, cucumbers, melons, and many other things in her garden.

* * * * *

"It was dusky twilight when we hastened home to the quarter. When we arrived, the overseer had not yet come. He had been at his cotton field, with the people he had hired in the morning to work for him; but he soon made his appearance, and going into his house, came out with a small bag of money, and paid each one the price he had a right to receive. In this transaction, the overseer acted with entire fairness to the people who worked for him; and with the exception of the moral turpitude of violating the Sabbath in this shameful manner, the business was conducted with propriety.

"I must here observe, that when the slaves go out to work for wages on Sunday, their employers never flog them; and so far as I know, never give them abusive language. I have often hired myself to work on Sunday, and have been employed in this way by more than fifty different persons, not one of whom ever insulted, or maltreated me in any way. They seldom took the trouble of coming to look at me until towards evening, and sometimes not then. I worked faithfully, because I knew that if I did not, I could not expect payment; and those who hired me, knew that if I did not work well, they need not employ me.

"The practice of working on Sunday is so universal

"amongst the slaves on the cotton plantations, that the immorality of the matter is never spoken of."

On this plantation our narrator remained till the month of September, 1806, when he departed for Georgia as a part of the marriage portion of one of his master's daughters. He had narrowly escaped a dreadful death on one occasion, being suspected of a horrible crime, which in the event proved to have been committed by a fellow slave. The credit which he had obtained for his courage and skill in discovering the real perpetrator of the crime, and his good conduct in the management of a fishing establishment, induced his new master to confide to him almost the sole care of a new plantation in Georgia. And he felt no disposition to violate this confidence. But his young master soon fell in a duel, and his mistress died. He now fell, with the plantation, into the hands of a man who paid a yearly rent both for the land and slaves. The description of this man and his wife, so strikingly illustrates the troubles of kind masters, and the effect of the possession of arbitrary power upon the domestic economy, that we crave the reader's perusal of it.

"Fortune had now thrown me into the power of a new master, of whom, when I considered the part of the country from whence he came, which had always been represented to me, as distinguished for the cruelty with which slaves were treated in it, I had no reason to expect much that was good. I had indeed, from the moment I saw this new master, and had learned the place of his former residence, made up my mind to prepare myself for a harsh servitude; but as we are often disappointed for the worse, so it sometimes happens that we are deceived for the better. This man was by no means so bad as I was prepared to find him; and yet, I experienced all the evils in his service that I had ever apprehended: but I could never find in my heart to entertain a revengeful feeling toward him, for he was as much a slave as I was; and I believe of the two, the greater sufferer. Perhaps the evils he endured himself, made him more compassionate of the sorrows of others; but notwithstanding the injustice that was done me while with him, I could never look upon him as a bad man."

"Our mistress gave us a specimen of her character, on the first morning after her arrival amongst us, by beating

“severely, with a raw cow-hide, the black girl who nursed the infant, because the child cried, and could not be kept silent. I perceived by this that my mistress possessed no control over her passions; and that when enraged, she would find some victim to pour her fury upon, without regard to justice or mercy.

“When we were called to dinner to-day, we had no meat, and a very short supply of bread; our meal being composed of badly cooked sweet potatoes, some bread, and a very small quantity of sour milk. From this time our allowance of meat was withdrawn from us altogether, and we had to live upon our bread, potatoes, and the little milk that our mistress permitted us to have. The most vexatious part of the new discipline was the distinction that was made between us, who were on the plantation before our mistress came to it, and the slaves that she brought with her. To these latter, she gave the best part of the sour milk, all the buttermilk, and I believe, frequently rations of meat.

“We were not on our part, (I mean us of the old stock,) wholly without meat, for our master sometimes gave us a whole fitch of bacon at once: this he had stolen from his own smoke house—I say stolen, because he took it without the knowledge of my mistress; and always charged us in the most solemn manner, not to let her know that we had received it. She was as negligent of the duties of a good housewife, as she was arrogant in assuming the control of things not within the sphere of her domestic duties; and never missed the bacon that our master gave to us, because she had not taken the trouble of examining the state of the meat house. Obtaining all the meat we ate by stealth, through our master, our supplies were not regular; coming once or twice a week, according to circumstances. However, as I was satisfied of the good intentions of my master towards me, I felt interested in his welfare, and in a short time became warmly attached to him. He fared but little better at the hands of my mistress than I did, except that as he ate at the same table with her, he always had enough of comfortable food; but in the matter of ill language, I believe my master and I might safely have put our goods together, as a joint stock in trade, without either one or the other being greatly the loser. I

“had secured the good opinion of my master, and it was
“perceivable by any one that he had more confidence in me
“than in any of his other slaves, and often treated me as
“the foreman of his people.

“This aroused the indignation of my mistress, who,
“with all her ill qualities, retained a sort of selfish esteem
“for the slaves, who had come with her from her father’s
“estate. She seldom saw me, without giving me her cus-
“tomary salutation of profanity; and she exceeded all other
“persons that I have ever known in the quickness and sar-
“casm of the jibes, and jeers, with which she seasoned her
“oaths. To form any fair conception of her volubility, and
“scurrilous wit, it was necessary to hear her, more espe-
“cially on Sunday morning, or a rainy day, when the peo-
“ple were all loitering about the kitchens, which stood close
“round her dwelling. She treated my master with no more
“ceremony than she did me. Misery loves company, it is
“said; and I verily believe that my master and I felt a mu-
“tual attachment on account of our mutual sufferings.”

Charles Ball’s new master soon sickened, and died. Even before his death, his amiable spouse signalized her near prospect of sovereign control, by giving Charles a merciless flogging, for no crime but that of being the object of her husband’s kindness and confidence. Rightly judging that he should lead a sad life of it under this virago, he only waited for the green corn to be ready to roast, when he addressed himself to the perilous task of returning by land to Maryland. The hardships of such a task may be faintly imagined, by one who understands the police regulations of slavery and the geography of the South—here they may be seen; and whoever reads this narrative, or listens to that of any other fugitive, who has in this way achieved his escape from Georgia, and does not believe this portion of the United States the darkest Egypt of tyranny on the face of our planet, must be both ignorant and obstinate. Our hero safely reached his wife and children, but not till the next summer. In Maryland he managed to live as a *free man* till 1830. He had acted the patriot before the cannon’s mouth in the last war, and had become a freeholder of twelve acres of ground, and a commodious cabin. In an hour when he least thought of so dreadful a reverse, the fangs of the kidnapper were again fastened upon him. He found himself

once more a field slave in Georgia, and that twenty years of the march of time and of mind had given no new charms to that much lauded mode of existence. He ran away, and was recovered. At last he succeeded in stowing himself, as many a man has done, among the bales of cotton in the hold of a ship bound for Philadelphia. He stole back to his own cabin near Baltimore. It was occupied by a white man—his wife and children had been dragged into the like bondage from which he had escaped—none could tell him where. He now lives in Pennsylvania.

Believing, as we have privately good reason to do, that this book contains, in the language of a faithful interpreter, a true narrative which has fallen from the lips of a veritable fugitive, we have only to regret that there is not an appendix of some sort, containing some documentary evidence to that effect.

ON ABSTINENCE FROM THE PRODUCTS OF SLAVE LABOR.

BY THE EDITOR.

At the late annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society, it was, on motion of GERRIT SMITH, Esq., "*Resolved*. That this society earnestly and affectionately invites its members, and the members of its auxiliaries, diligently and prayerfully to examine the question, whether they can innocently make an ordinary use, or be concerned in the traffic of the productions of slave labor."

As it is the primary object of the American Anti-Slavery Society to convince all their fellow-citizens, "by arguments addressed to their understandings and consciences, that slaveholding is a heinous crime in the sight of God," there was an obvious propriety in propounding the inquiry contained in the foregoing resolution. Reformers must be, or at least, must honestly aim to be, pure of the sin they rebuke. This is requisite, not only to commend them to the consciences of others, but to save them from the goadings of their own. "A sinful heart makes feeble hand." And

inasmuch as the productions of slave labor, in some shape or other, enter into almost every thing we use, it becomes almost indispensable to decide whether we can use them without sin, before we can stir a step. If there are, then, as was abundantly evidenced by the discussion in the society, previous to the adoption of the resolution, doubts and discordancy of views among the members of the society itself on this subject, there can be no doubt of the pertinence of this resolution, nor of its harmony with the design of the society. To help to a right decision, we proceed to offer a few suggestions, which we advertise the reader not to consider as coming with any official authority. God forbid that we should seek to bind, much less to release, any man's conscience, except by the naked force of truth.

We sometimes meet with an argument which may be comprised in the following syllogism. If slaveholding is a heinous crime in the sight of God, all participation in it must be also criminal. But using the products of slave labor is a participation in slaveholding. Therefore, using the products of slave labor must be criminal. If the minor proposition is sound, we shall not reject the conclusion; but there lies the question. We feel disposed to deny its truth, or at least, its universality, because—1. By the mere act of purchasing the goods of the slaveholder, I no more approve or give my sanction to the injustice by which those goods were obtained, than I approve or sanction any other crime of which the seller may be guilty. Indeed, I may, with the greatest abhorrence of his injustice, purchase its products for the very purpose of counteracting it. No man understands me as saying, by the act of purchasing a bale of cotton, that the morality of refusing pay to the people who hoed and picked it was good, any more than he understands me as saying that the same cotton was raised, ginned, and pressed in the most economical way. 2. By purchasing of the slaveholder, I do not aid, abet, or encourage him, unless it can be shown, either that I do the act with that design, or that it actually has that effect. Now, we may certainly use slave labor products without any wish or design thereby to maintain the bondage of the slave. It is probable that very little sugar or cotton is consumed with that motive. And in order to show that our use of these or other products does actually have the effect to aid

and encourage the slaveholder to continue his sin, it must be shown that our abstinence will prevent, or at least tend to prevent, his continuance. And this cannot be done without showing a reasonable probability that our abstinence will produce a sensible effect upon the market. So far as the design is to lessen the demand, and of course put less money in the pocket of the slaveholder, if the effort totally fails, it is worse than useless. But here it will be said, if all would abstain, slavery would cease at once, and we are responsible for our part of the work, whether others will do theirs or not. Let it be here remembered, that there is nothing criminal in the mere acts of eating rice and wearing cotton, but in so eating rice and wearing cotton as to encourage slavery. Now, let us see whether, in the present state of things, a scrupulous and total abstinence from slave labor products would not encourage slavery more than it would discourage it. First then, to practice a total abstinence we must not only lay aside slave labor sugar and rice, but all cotton fabrics, and those of which cotton is any part. Our merchants and manufacturers must throw perhaps half their stock and their capital into the fire. The property thus sacrificed would amount to ten times the sum ever expended in the prosecution of the anti-slavery cause, and the loss would very much impair the ability of abolitionists to give hereafter. But all this is a mere trifle. No anti-slavery agent, or other abolitionist, must now travel in stage or steam-boat, for the sheets and the table cloths of the latter are of cotton, and the former has its top lined with calico. No abolitionist can any longer buy a book, or take a newspaper printed on common paper. The society must suspend all its publications till it can import or manufacture, at a greatly enhanced expense, paper of linen. Indeed, if the principle that the use of slave labor products is sinful, had been adopted at first, the anti-slavery reformation could not have started an inch. If it should be introduced now, it would immediately stop. We hardly need say that such a result would greatly encourage slavery. For even suppose that all who profess to be abolitionists, should have come up to the point of total abstinence supposed, it would not diminish the demand for cotton a hair's breadth.— Among the constant fluctuations of the market, the deficiency would no more be perceived than a drop from the ocean.

We wish it to be observed, that this argument does not go the length of allowing and justifying to any and every extent the use of slave labor products. It is designed only to test the broad principle, that the use of slave labor products is a participation in slaveholding. And we say, confidently, that a man *may* buy and use any product of slave labor, which is in itself proper to be used, without at all participating in the crime which attended the production. We think that he who denies this, would shut the reformer totally from his work, and would rob the very salt of abolitionism of its savor.

We are aware that we shall here be assailed with divers objections and difficulties, and we may as well stop, and attend to one of them before we proceed to the positive part of our argument.

It will be asked, how do you get over the principle that "the partaker is as bad as the thief?" 'Are not the goods stolen from the poor slaves, and by buying them, do we not make ourselves the receivers of stolen goods?' Not exactly so. The slaves are stolen property we admit—stolen from themselves. But the cotton raised by their labor is not, strictly speaking, stolen, any more than the corn raised by means of a stolen horse. If a man buys the corn at a fair price, even knowing how it was raised, we suppose the law does not regard him as accessory to the theft of the horse. The partaker of theft *is* truly as bad as the thief, but the consumer of slave labor products is not always a partaker of the man-stealing. The buyer of stolen goods gets them sufficiently under their value to compensate him for the risk run; but it may be easily shown that the buyer of slave labor products pays more than if slavery did not exist. If in a certain neighborhood the only mill seat is occupied by a man who takes too much toll out of every poor man's grist, it does not follow that every other man who carries a grist to that mill consents to the iniquity or encourages it, or in any degree partakes of it. The patronage thus conferred, provided there be no remonstrance or rebuke, no public expression of condemnation on the part of him who yields it, may be one among many arguments to show that he supports and encourages the iniquity. But who will say that the man acts inconsistently with his doctrine, when he condemns the dishonesty of the miller, and yet carries corn

to his mill. The reader will please not to mistake this comparison for an argument; we have used it only to illustrate our idea. The slaveholders have engrossed a large portion of the earth, to the products of which, through the medium of fair commerce, the rest of the world has a right; and if in the production they have adopted a grinding system of oppression, their customers are not necessarily responsible. A principle which would make them responsible, would put an end to commerce, and cut off all intercourse between man and man. If we are not greatly mistaken, an apostle has sanctioned this argument in a similar case. He had written to the Corinthians not to associate with fornicators, yet, if we understand him, he afterwards informs them that he did not intend to cut off *all* intercourse with "the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters, *for then must ye needs go out of the world.*"—(1 Cor. v. 10.) "To the pure all things are pure," and in the spirit of this maxim, we believe abolitionists—all who faithfully reprove slavery and zealously labor for its overthrow—in many cases may, and ought to use the products of slave labor.

But if it be decided that using the products of slave labor is not sinful as an act of participation, on what principle shall we regulate our conduct? Shall we abstain at all? And if so, how far? and for what reason? We answer: let us abstain as far as we can without impairing our influence in the cause of human rights. And let us do this on the principle of doing to others as we would have them do to us,—of remembering those in bonds as bound with them.

Mr. Clarkson informs us that after the loss in the House of Commons, in 1791, of Mr. Wilberforce's motion for the abolition of the slave trade, about 300,000 persons in England came into the practice of abstaining from West India sugar. Though there may be a doubt whether even this large number of abstinents produced any perceptible effect upon the market, yet there can be no doubt that the practice produced a great and salutary effect upon their own minds, and upon the minds of thousands of others. It was a loud and practical rebuke of slavery. It was an index of sincerity and zeal. It was an ever present memento of the oppressed. It was truly, as our amiable coadjutors, the Friends, call it, "a testimony."

Had we fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, or wives and children in slavery, should we be willing to use the products extorted from their toil? We should bestow our patronage somewhere else, if possible. We should not feel like sweetening our tea with sugar bought for us at the price of a brother's blood. And surely, if the fact of our abstaining had any chance of exerting a moral influence in behalf of our brother, we should feel it our *duty* to abstain, even at some inconvenience. We feel as though on this point abolitionists would go right as a matter of course; that whether they make an "ordinary use," or ordinarily abstain, they will always act with a conscientious reference to the great law of Christian benevolence, both in regard to master and slave. It is, in our humble opinion, impossible to fit a *physical* rule to the moral conditions of the question. Those who have the ability to wear linen, may be quite justifiable in rigidly abstaining from cotton, but we know persons whose usefulness in the anti-slavery cause would be impaired by substituting the costlier for the cheaper fabric—these same persons, however, will be none the poorer, or the less able to plead for the poor, by eating bread instead of cake, or drinking their tea without sugar, or by drinking no tea at all. So far, then, as bringing the morality of the matter up to a physical line, or recommending a definite rule of practice is concerned, we do not see but the society will have to leave the question where it found it.

We certainly hope they will do so, for we are exceedingly jealous of the exaltation of *physical expedients* into the place of *moral power*, for the removal of slavery. Starving is not convincing. The grand object of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as set forth in its constitution, is to bring about a full and thorough emancipation, as the result of *conviction*. And this object it is laboring to effect by inducing such a state of moral feeling at the North, as will be irresistible at the South—surrounding the slaveholders with so many moral looking-glasses, that they can turn no way without seeing themselves at full length—till such time as they abhor themselves, and repent in sackcloth and ashes. Every physical expedient should be kept in the most strict subservience to this great design. Some suppose, and it may be true, that the cultivation of beet-sugar may be made to supplant the slave grown cane-sugar of Louisiana and Florida. Now, so far as beet-sugar is important to answer

the profound objection against abolitionism, that slavery is *necessary* to sweeten our cakes and tea, it may be proper for the American Anti-Slavery Society to encourage its cultivation. But when beet-sugar is cultivated in order to make cane-sugar unprofitable, it is no longer an argument addressed to the "understanding and conscience" of any body, but an argument addressed solely to the *pockets* of the Louisiana and Florida planters. And however right and proper it may be to others, it then becomes to the American Anti-Slavery Society a wholly *unconstitutional* argument. It comes in to let down, and mar, and secularize the society's glorious plan. From the moment the society should adopt such an argument, we should feel that it had not only violated its constitution, but retreated from the contest.

Now, it is precisely on this ground that we deprecate the society's making abstinence from slave labor products one of the means of bringing about the overthrow of slavery. Suppose the whole world should abstain from these products, and the slave states should thereby be compelled formally to abolish slavery. So far as the abolition was produced by this means, it would rest on no principle but necessity; it would be a slavish act; the sin would be unrepented of, and the chance is, that the reformation would be rather nominal than real. For there could not be, in the southern states, as in the West Indies, hosts of special justices to watch the unwilling benefactors, and secure the rights of the weaker party. But so far as a preference for free labor products, or abstinence from those of slave labor, is requisite to give due force to our appeal to the "understandings and consciences," of our fellow citizens, it certainly lies within the constitutional limits of the society to recommend it; and if a majority of the society do believe that all use of things produced in whole or in part by the labor of slaves, is a moral participation in the sin of slaveholding, then they must certainly understand the constitution as giving them power to resolve upon total abstinence, for upon no other basis can the means proposed in the constitution be put in successful operation. It will, in this event, be unfortunate for the society that a truth so primary, a principle so fundamental had not been discovered and acted upon at first; but nothing can be gained by refusing to receive the truth, and act on the principle when discovered.

In the present state of the question, therefore, we think the society could not have done more wisely than to invite its members to a diligent and prayerful examination of it ; and we hope it will continue to welcome the *free discussion* of it, till the *right practice* is placed upon the *right principle*.

JUDGE LAWLESS vs. LAW.

BY THE EDITOR.

THOUGH the welfare of a country depends, no doubt, very much upon the wisdom and justice of its laws, yet it is matter of history that a high degree of prosperity and national happiness has often been attained under very bad laws. Despots have availed themselves of this fact to justify their oppression, and prevail upon the people to bear their yoke in quietness. But there is a principle, more important than equity of law, which is vital to national prosperity and which can never be safely infringed. The social fabric rests upon it. Wherever, under any form of government, we see order, security, industry, arts, wealth and the social happiness of civilized life, we see them as the fruit of this universal unchanging principle, viz.: that, whatever may be the justice of the law, *it shall not be set at nought with impunity*. A law which is once openly set at defiance and safely triumphed over, by any man or by any combination of men, is a mockery—it is no law. The safety of all depends upon the public opinion, that the law *will always prevail* over every power with which it may come in conflict. Let this opinion be obliterated from the public mind, and the throne sinks, the constitution is dissolved into vanity—the machinery of government, of whatever sort it may be, tumbles into the wreck of anarchy. A good man, even if compelled by his conscience to violate a bad law, would weep to see the executioners of law, (provided the law were constitutional) shrink from imposing its penalty. He would wish to triumph over the law, but not in that way. His appeal against the law would be not to the judge but to the legislator. The judge, as a judge, has nothing to do with the

justice or injustice of the law. So long as the law is not plainly unconstitutional, it is his sole duty to put it in execution. He has no business to calculate the practicability or impracticability of enforcing his decisions. He has no right to be appalled at the number, power, or violence of offenders. It is no part of his duty to look at consequences. He has but one thing to do, and that is to go straight forward, according to law.

In a monarchy, the throne stands behind the law, with its very existence staked on the principle so vital to the welfare of the community, that the law *shall prevail*. Had the throne as much interest in having good laws, as it has in having the laws executed, much less could be said against monarchy. The fault of monarchy has been found to be, that it favors unequal laws, exalts the few over the many, and makes the good of the people the secondary object of government. Republicanism makes the people their own lawgivers. As a matter of course their laws cannot be oppressive to the many, though they may be unjust to the few.* The chance is manifestly in favor of republican laws. But it remains to be seen whether a republic can carry its laws into execution. What shall stand behind the law, in place of the throne? What tremendous power shall penetrate the entire community with the conviction, that "though hand join in hand," offenders shall not go unpunished? There is nothing out of the people themselves that can do it. Every patriot in this respect must act the part of a king. He must feel that his country is his kingdom, that her laws are his laws, and that his throne stands only while they are obeyed. He should regard the prostration of the law as an attack upon his authority, an invasion of his rights, a triumph over his power. It is not now a question with him whether the particular law be wise or foolish, just or unjust. The fact that the law is not such as his individual judgment approves, does not abate a particle the indignation he feels that it should be trampled upon. Nor does it matter with him what was the object which the violators of law aimed to secure. It may have been one that he himself would have voted to secure by law; he feels, therefore, that his own au-

* When a republic comprehends within its pale only a part of the people resident within its geographical limits, its laws may be grievously oppressive to the many; e. g. South Carolina.

thority has been outraged, and his wishes frustrated by a futile attempt to secure it against law. He is jealous for the vital principle of the government in which he bears a part. He knows that his own shoulders are charged with the responsibility of the decision, whether the people can govern themselves. Just in proportion as this feeling animates the mass of the community, in that proportion will be the security of our institutions and our rights.

It is a most alarming symptom in the present state of the country, that when the law has been prostrated, and prostrated in the way of all the most dangerous to a republic, by popular tumult, and when the rebuke of the sovereign people ought to have been heard like seven thunders, scarcely a note of remonstrance has been uttered. The most shameful outrages upon law have even been excused, because, as was said, the victims of illegal violence had given great provocation, and were yet innocent of any transgression of law—thus there was a necessity that the *people should* take the matter into their own hands—as if a mob of two or three thousand ruffians were the *people*!

But dangerous as is the prevalence of mob-law and “lynch-law,” and the impunity with which they are almost every where practised, there is still another step in the downward road to anarchy. And it has remained for a Missouri Judge, very appropriately named *Lawless*, to take it. It is one thing to let mobs escape unpunished, by a mere empty show of authority, and another to proclaim from the bench of justice the principle, that mobs, even the most atrocious, are not to be punished. It is one thing “to bear the sword in vain,” and another to surrender it openly to murderers. It is one thing for a mob to elude the sentence of the court, and quite another to gain the sanction of the court.

The doctrine of Judge Lawless is the more important, because there is reason to believe that it will be received and acted upon, as indeed it has been practically anticipated, in more than half of this nation, as good *law*! The rest of the world, judging from our practice, will consider it the established principle of our administration of justice!—The exponent of our morals and our political philosophy. It will cause the highest rejoicing among the enemies of America in other lands, and shut the mouths of her friends in shame and grief.

'The occasion ~~was as follows~~. On the 28th of April, an ordinary affray occurred between two sailors, or boatmen, in the city of St. Louis. They were arrested by the proper officers, whereupon a mulatto man, named McIntosh, interfered, and occasioned the escape of the prisoners. He was himself taken into custody, and led towards the jail. On his way, he inquired of the officers what would be his punishment. The officers took upon themselves the responsibility of replying, that it would be at least five years imprisonment* in the penitentiary. McIntosh immediately drew a knife, wounded one of the officers, and slew the other. His flight was prevented, and he was safely lodged in prison to await his trial for the murder. A mob, however, was soon raised, which proceeded to the prison, forcibly effected an entrance, dragged out the prisoner, bound him by a chain to a locust tree, kindled a fire around him, in which after an agony of twenty minutes he expired, and then left his cindered corpse to be pelted with stones by a rabble of boys!

Some of the *Aldermen of the city*, and many distinguished citizens, were seen actively engaged in perpetrating this horrid piece of savagism. The feeble remonstrances of the Sheriff, and a few others, were treated with contempt. There was not the least show of resistance on the part of the civil authorities.

The question soon arose, whether these high-handed murderers should be punished. The newspapers of St. Louis had strenuously contended that the act of the murderers was not to be charged upon the city. The response was, We shall see what you will do with the criminals. In this state of the case, it became necessary for the grand jury of the county of St. Louis to inquire into the matter. The charge which they received from Judge Lawless, and by which they were guided, is altogether new, we apprehend, in the administration of justice in this or any other country. He thus lays down the doctrine by which the terrible sword of law is humbly delivered over to the mob!

"I have reflected much on this matter, and after weighing all the considerations that present themselves as bearing upon it, I feel it my duty to state my opinion to be, that,

* We have heard it stated that they replied it would be death.

“whether the Grand Jury shall act at all, depends upon
“the solution of this preliminary question, namely, whether
“the destruction of McIntosh was the act of the ‘few,’ or
“the act of the ‘many.’

“If on a calm view of the circumstances attending this
“transaction, you shall be of opinion that it was perpetrated
“by a definite, and, compared to the population of St.
“Louis, a *small* number of individuals, separate from the
“mass, and evidently taking upon themselves, as contradis-
“tinguished from the multitude, the responsibility of the
“act, my opinion is, that you ought to indict them all with-
“out a single exception.

“If, on the other hand, the destruction of the murderer of
“Hammond was the act, as I have said, of the many—of
“the multitude, in the ordinary sense of those words—not
“the act of numerable and ascertainable malefactors, but of
“congregated thousands, seized upon and impelled by that
“mysterious, metaphysical, and almost electric phrenzy,
“which, in all ages and nations, has hurried on the infu-
“riated multitude to deeds of death and destruction—then,
“I say, act not at all in the matter—the case then transcends
“your jurisdiction—it is beyond the reach of human law.”

In pursuance of this charge, the Grand Jury came to the
result, that “the destruction of the free negro, McIntosh,
“was the act of the populace, an assemblage of several thou-
“sand persons, for which five or ten individuals could not
“be made responsible; so far from it, it was satisfactorily
“shown, that any decided opposition to, or any attempt to
“prevent, the perpetration of the act by that number of per-
“sons, would have endangered their lives.”

In all this it must not be supposed that Judge Lawless
urges that the act of the citizens of St. Louis was not criminal. He expressly concedes that it was murder in the
highest degree by the common law, and “at least, in the
second degree” by the law of Missouri; that if the authority
to punish had been legal, the *mode* was outrageously uncon-
stitutional; that though the criminality of McIntosh could
not afford the least excuse or palliation, yet there was a
chance that he might have been proved innocent;* he
even concedes to the full the danger of the precedent to the

* Till proved guilty, he was *legally* innocent.

liberties of the country, and with the truth upon his lips that "nothing but a reasoned obedience to the constituted authorities and to the law, saves this land from desolation," he proceeds to speak of the *murderers* as "the people themselves—the source of power—the makers of the law," over whom there can be no control! He calls the bloodthirsty and hellish rage of the man roasters, a "*generous excitement*"!! He would have the Grand Jury understand that they were overpowered by their sympathy for the wretched widow and orphans of the murdered Hammond. Had this been true, though it would have been no reason for permitting the murderers of McIntosh to escape, it would have given a very different bearing to the affair. There would have been far less danger in winking at the crime, for as it was insulated and peculiar, the violated law might have recovered from its deep wound. But it was not true. It is perfectly incredible that a sight no more unusual in the streets of St. Louis than that of bloody murder and widows' tears, could have excited the populace to wrench the criminal from the hands of justice, where he was safely lodged. The *lawless* judge himself, in this very charge, gives abundant evidence of a different cause. McIntosh owed the mode of his death not to his crime, but to his *complexion*. Though the case had not the remotest possible connexion with abolitionism, yet the Judge has no sooner instructed the Grand Jury how to proceed in their inquiry, than he endeavors to throw the responsibility for McIntosh's crime upon the abolitionists. And he regrets the vengeance of the citizens, because it had prevented the opportunity of throwing the blame more fully upon those "misguided and unprincipled men." Now, was the judge the first to make this discovery? No; the same malice against the abolitionists and the men of "negro-blood," which bursts forth in the charge of Judge Lawless, rankled in the hearts of the citizens of St. Louis, and developed itself in the flames which curled about the body of the wretched McIntosh. The sufferer writhing in his hot chains, and drinking the wrath of that demoniac crew, was not a man suffering for the murder of a husband and a father, he was a *negro* expiating the more atrocious crime of raising his hand against a *white* man,—aye, the still more atrocious crime of belonging to a race which the friends of

human nature are endeavoring to lift from under the feet of tyrants. There is no class of men who more patiently wait the law's delay than the slaveholders, when a *white* of their own class is the criminal. But when a poor man of "negro-blood,"—though copiously diluted with the best *white* blood of Carolina—presumes to imitate them, and act on the same principle of violence, which with them is almost too honorable for law to interfere with, the law is too tardy an instrument of vengeance. The culprit must die on the spot like a mad beast. He must suffer not only for his own sins, but for all the sins of his white friends. A burnt sacrifice must be made of him, to intimidate the abolitionists, and appease the insulted spirit of the South.

The charge of Judge Lawless, then, is not to be viewed as a mere connivance at an illegal, though generous outburst of popular sympathy. It is a traitorous surrender of the last shred of legal protection of the colored man, or of any of his friends, at the South, or wherever else such a decision may have authority. It gives the solemn sanction of law to any and every outrage that a sufficiently large mob may choose to perpetrate, and it points out a class of suitable victims. It was the business of the Judge to charge the Grand Jury to find indictments against the perpetrators of a *pro-slavery murder*. What does he do? He in effect tells the Grand Jury, if they find the murder to have been such,—to have been the fruit of that madness which pervades the South—to leave the murderers to themselves, and turn their attention to the *St. Louis Observer*, and the anti-slavery publications! Here, he tells them, is the fons malorum. He is satisfied without any inquiry, and without directing the inquest to make any, that McIntosh was under "abolitionist influence." Does it not follow from this *lawless* charge, that if the citizens of St. Louis could with impunity burn the deluded McIntosh, much more might they burn with impunity the Rev. E. P. Lovejoy, the editor of the *St. Louis Observer*?

This charge is the last link of a complete demonstration, that the slaveholding states are determined to persist in a flagrant violation of the constitution of the United States. While we at the North are nursing the Union, and framing all sorts of anathemas to be poured upon the head of him who shall dare impiously to ask the value of it, the slave-

holding South, in one phalanx, is trampling upon the conditions of that Union, and haughtily proclaiming her determination to continue to do so. When our fathers entered into the union, it was on the express condition that the rights of the citizen should be every where under the shield of law. The citizens of each state were to be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states. No person was to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. No person was to be punished for any crime, without a fair trial before an impartial jury, without having full information of the charge brought against him, nor without being confronted with the witnesses against him, and having compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor. The people were to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures, and against excessive, cruel, and unusual punishments. Above all, every citizen was to enjoy that noblest privilege of republicanism, FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND OF THE PRESS. Now, it is most arrant trifling with both our rights and our dignity, to pretend that these conditions have not every one of them, by the slaveholding states, been trampled under foot. There is not a country upon earth where a man has less liberty or is in more danger of brutal and arbitrary punishment, than is the citizen of a northern state in the southern half of this republic! He must owe his safety to an unmanly suppression or disavowal of every correct opinion in regard to human rights, and of every humane feeling towards the victims of oppression all around him. If he would not be physically outraged or murdered, by a now *lawlessly legalized* mob, he must *crawl* through the South on the hands and knees of his moral being. It is notoriously true, that he cannot hope to enjoy any one of the conditions stipulated for him when this Union was formed. And what worse can be said of the vilest tyranny that ever existed? There never was one where a citizen could not be tolerably safe, *if he would consent to crawl*.

Unhappily there is no need of our adducing facts to substantiate this charge. They are fresh in the memories of all. They are scattered all over the history of slavery. They are so common that they have ceased to excite attention. It has come to be considered a settled point that if the citizen of a northern state is "lynched" at the South, nobody must

complain about it lest it should endanger the Union ! Our fathers threw their republicanism into joint stock with the republicanism of the South. Whatever may have been the value of the stock originally brought in by the southern partner, it has long since become a negative quantity, and the demand is that our part shall be subjected to the same process. And many profess to be astonished that there should be any hesitation to comply with so reasonable a request. Law has not always reigned at the North. In the case of the Charlestown convent riot, cited by Judge Lawless, there was, as we have no disposition to deny, a most gross and shameful delinquency ; though we never heard that the Judge charged the Grand Jury not to *find indictments*, provided the mob turned out to have been composed of a considerable portion of *the people* of Charlestown. But that case had no bearing upon the great compact between the North and the South. So far as regards that compact, we have done every thing that we agreed to. Up to this moment the rights of a southern citizen, let him say or print what he will, are as secure at the North as those of any of our citizens. Suppose some southern desperado, induced by the large rewards offered for the principal abolitionists, had murdered one of them, or any other man, in the streets of Utica. Would he have been wrested from the officers of justice by an infuriated mob ? Would he have been burnt in chains ? Would a northern judge have then charged the grand inquest of Oneida county to inquire whether the diabolical act were that of the "few," or the "many," and indict accordingly ? Would he have added that the crime was, no doubt, instigated by the *pro-slavery editors*, and recommend a memorial to the legislature for a law to *punish them* ? Most certainly nothing like this, or any part of it, could have happened. It would have been out of all character. And, be it observed, we have supposed a case of natural and obvious connection between the criminal provocation and the policy of the South, whereas in the attack of the mulatto McIntosh upon the deputy Sheriff Hammond, first in behalf of some quarrelling sailors (whites we suppose*), and secondly, to save him

* None of the accounts we have seen designate the color, as they doubtless would have done had it been other than white.

self from a punishment which he considered unjustly severe, there is no indication at all of any abolition influence, save what the judge, more learned than *lawful*, has pleased to fancy. The poor wretch professed his hostility to the whole white race—when they were dragging him to the stake—he sang and prayed in the flames,—hence the judge infers he was under “abolitionist influence”!!—No. We repeat it, nothing like this has been done or ever will be at the North. We have stood to the bargain to the letter. But the South has not. She has violated every article of it which she pleased to fancy was likely, if kept, to interfere with her system of licensed robbery, lust, and murder. And now, what we ask of our fellow citizens of the North is, not that they should tear in pieces, and scatter to the winds this violated, insulted bond of Union; but that they would have the manhood to require the parties of the other part to govern themselves by the terms of the compact, as they are expressed on the face of the Constitution to which they have sworn.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

BRITISH WEST INDIES.

THOUGH the facts we have heretofore given are perfectly conclusive of the safety of the immediate and unqualified emancipation of the most degraded slaves, and though there is not one of all the Reverend Rabbies who preach the unfitness of the slaves for freedom, that dares deny one syllable of these facts, yet we deem it our duty to give ‘line upon line.’ We have just received, from the office of the London Anti-Slavery Society, a pamphlet of 68 octavo pages, entitled “*STATEMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS on the working of the laws for the abolition of slavery throughout the British Colonies, and on the PRESENT STATE OF THE NEGRO POPULATION, March 1st, 1836.*” This pamphlet contains the most abundant and conclusive evidence that the masters have availed themselves of the power still indulged to them in the apprentice system, to abuse their former slaves to such an extent, that they have forfeited all claim to the continuance of that indulgence. But that to which we wish principally to call the attention of the reader, is the good conduct of the negro, whether fully or partly emancipated.

“The almost universally good conduct of the apprentices, is so generally known and acknowledged, as to render it scarcely necessary to enter on the subject here, or to give at any considerable length, documents in proof of it.

Their excellent and praiseworthy conduct at the period when the Emancipation act came into operation, was noticed in the postscript to 'the last number of the 'Anti-Slavery Reporter' (No. 112). Since that period, there has been no falling off in this respect: all parties, with the exception of some of the least respectable class of planters of the old school of Slavery, have expressed themselves satisfied with their general conduct. Governors and Lieutenant-governors, Bishops, and the Clergy of all denominations, military commanders and civil functionaries, have coincided in adding the testimony of their approbation. This will be sufficiently shown by the few extracts which follow.

JAMAICA.—Extract of a Despatch from the Marquis of Sligo, Governor of Jamaica, to Lord Glenelg, dated 21st June, 1835.

The following are a few memoranda respecting Jamaica, the result of some consideration and observation, combined with the best information that could be procured:—

1. The quality of the sugar made this year is *bona fide* far superior to what has been heretofore made by night work on the majority of estates in this island.

2. There has been by far less stock lost in this year's crop than in that of preceding years, and in many places, it has been taken off by a smaller number.

3. The stock are, generally speaking, in much better condition this year, than they were at the close of any former year's crop, when they have been so weak that many of them have died in consequence.

4. That, the apprentices generally are evidently becoming more reconciled to the system, and work cheerfully for money hire, both night and day, and that they are becoming better behaved every day.

5. That, they may be expected still further to improve, as soon as they begin to feel the natural impetus of education and religion, and as they get rid of the system of deceit which Slavery occasioned, in order to save them from oppression.

6. That several estates will exceed the present crop in the next year, and the majority will equal it.

7. That when this is not the case, it can be traced to sufficient causes, independent of the loss of labor, which of course must have considerable effect, when it is recollected that on many estates the slaves were compelled not only to work day and night as long as nature would allow of it, and in such manner as their bodily endurance would permit, for the six week days, but were often compelled to pot sugar on the Sunday.

8. That a manifest supineness has been exhibited on several plantations, by the fact that the next year's crops are often estimated at much more than the present. I know of several individual instances of persons declining to put in plant canes last year, in consequence of the certainty, by anticipation, which they felt that the crop would not be taken off at all.

9. The returns I send home herewith, will show that the preparations for the next year's crop have not been so entirely neglected as has been asserted.

10. That "the new system" furnished a most admirable excuse for any failures and neglects which may have taken place, and which will not therefore be attributed to their real cause.

11. My conviction is, that in many instances, the opinions of individuals are much more favorable as to future prospects, than they choose to allow, and I offer, in proof of it, the reluctance which has been shown in but too many instances to my getting any information upon the subject.

12. That the overseers in many, I will fearlessly say, very many instances, have not given hearty co-operation to the new law, feeling themselves shorn of all their beams by its operation.

13. That many of the attorneys and managers have been so loud in their assertions of the failure of the system, that they are now unwilling to admit the errors of their opinions.

The first prophecy was, blood and destruction on the first of August: in this they were wrong. The second, that this scene would take place at Christmas, as it had not taken place in August: in this they were wrong. The third, that the apprentices would not work for wages: in this they were wrong, as I know

of no instance where the usual wages were offered, and where they were refused. The fourth was, that this crop could not be taken off: in this they were wrong, as it has been taken off in many places much earlier than usual; and if protracted in others, it has been as much from the weather, and the refusal to give wages in many instances, as from any other cause affecting the success of the new system.

14. Having been driven from all these points, they have now created for themselves a fresh object of terror, namely, the next year's crop. On this point I have had some doubts myself all along, and therefore send the information I have received, in order that judgment may be given by others. I freely confess, that the report is, on the whole, much more favorable than I ever expected.

15. That the manufacture and cultivation of sugar has been conducted on the most antiquated system possible, and has received the least possible assistance from the modern improvements in machinery. The plough is hardly ever used; where adopted this year from necessity, it has answered completely. The cattle mills, which are so general, must be abandoned, as they work so very slowly that they cannot meet the diminished hours of labor of the field gangs.

16. That the ginger, arrow-root, and coffee plantations, are as flourishing as ever they were known to be.

17. That the negroes will improve, because they have done so since the first of August, gradually but certainly, in all parts where severity has not been practised.

18. That they have had very little encouragement from many of the managers.

19. That in the whole of the early part, the number of Special Magistrates was quite insufficient, and this affects them more than might be at first imagined, as they shew unlimited confidence in those, (the great majority, I am proud to say) who treat them with true kindness.

20. That they passed their holidays at Christmas in an unusually orderly manner, and that there was, literally speaking, I verily believe, not twenty absentees from their labor on the 29th of December, and that they worked on New-Year's day without a murmur.

21. That there has been as yet no increase of religious instruction or education, and very little of good example. That the crop this year has been taken off without a single instance of assistance, and of a superior quality to that heretofore made.

22. That there has been less stock lost this year than usual.

23. That they have in most instances worked cheerfully, day and night (when allowed to do so by night), for hire, on five days of the week.

24. That they now dig cane holes in many parts of the island at one half-penny per hill, earning a dollar a-day, often digging 160 in a day, when seventy to eighty was their task during Slavery.

25. That several planters reluctantly confess, that more work has been done this year than the last, and that many objections have been made to my comparing this year's work to the last, because it was notorious they did not work at all last year.

26. That the amount of this year's is not, therefore, to be attributed to the exertions of the last year of slavery, as has been asserted. That every one confesses that things are going on, though not at all well, much better than they expected.

27. That there has been a singular want of uniformity in the administration of the law, which was not and could not be got over, till after some months' experience of it.

28. That there has been a great variance in their allowances, indulgences, and rates of payment.

29. That many have not been paid at all, but have been persuaded by the managers to give additional labor for their old allowances.

30. That the planters looked upon the Specials with great jealousy; and it was a struggle at first, in many places, to maintain as many of their old rights as possible.

31. That many planters have openly and loudly expressed their conviction, that the plan must be a perfect failure.

32. That many of the managers, though, thank God, not all, still maintain their former habits towards them, as far as the law allows them.

33. That there has been little time for the apprentices to reconcile their feelings to their former oppressors.

When all these things are recollected, and it is seen that under all these disadvantages they have behaved so well, and shewn such improvement, may it not naturally be inferred, that they are in a state of progressive amendment?

Thus much for the conduct of the apprentices. What now has been that of the whites? Of some of the managers I cannot speak too highly; but then they have reaped the fruit of their wisdom in the remarkable success which has attended their efforts. A reference to the reports, will show what success has attended the efforts of some, and how deplorable is the state of some of the properties under the management of others, though enjoying precisely similar advantages.

On the whole, I come to the conclusion, that the perfect success of the new system during the continuance of the apprenticeship, depends entirely on the conduct of the white people, and that if it fails, on them will rest the entire blame.

(Signed)

SLIGO.

At our last advices from London, an inquiry into the working of the apprenticeship system was going on before a Committee of the House of Commons. Dr. Madden, who brought the intelligence, was the first witness examined. He is of opinion that the inquiry, if it does no more, will result in shortening the apprenticeship. Dr. Madden has proceeded to Cuba as an agent of the British government for the suppression of the slave trade.

STATISTICS OF SLAVERY.

THE following valuable letter from JOHN FARMER, Esq. was only reserved from appearing in the last number, in the hope that the Editor would be able to bring it out in connection with other important statistics. But up to this day the pressure of other matters has prevented any further attention to the subject. Contributions from the pen of the accomplished historian of New Hampshire will always be welcome to our pages.

Concord, N. H. 1st February, 1836.

PROFESSOR E. WRIGHT,

Dear Sir,—My object in writing at this time is to furnish you with some additional statistics, and to correct one or two slight errors on the 3d page of the cover [of No. 2.] First, I will present you with the number of people of color in New England at different periods before the first U. States' Census was taken, which I derive from authentic sources.

IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

1730	200
1761	500
1775	659

From Holmes' Annals, Vol. II. p. 540, it appears that there were in 1761, in New Hampshire, 278 ratable polls of blacks. There were 102 in Portsmouth alone.

IN MASSACHUSETTS.

1763	5214
------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

IN CONNECTICUT.

1756	3587
1763	4500
1774	6464
1782	5300

The very gradual increase of the people of color in New England is observable as appears from the following.

	Maine.	N. H.	Vt.	Mass.	R. I.	Conn.	Total.
1790	538	788	271	5463	4355	5572	16,987
1800	918	860	557	6452	3684	6281	18,652
1810	969	970	750	6737	3717	6763	19,906
1820	929	786	918	6740	3602	7967	20,942
1830	1192	607	88	7049	3578	8072	21,379

The above includes the Slaves.

In 1830, there were in New England 81 colored persons who were 100 years old and upwards. The number of whites at the same time was 35. Of the colored population therefore, there were living, of 100 years and upwards, 1 to every 263, while of the white population there was only 1 to 55,235. In New Hampshire there were at that time 3 colored persons of 100 years and upwards, and 10 whites. There have been a number of colored persons in this State who have died at the age of more than a century. The names of but few have been preserved, as it was formerly thought of very little consequence to publish the deaths of such persons. In 1816, there died at Nottingham, Zene, a colored person, said to be 101; in Canterbury, Deborah, aged 102, died the same year. In 1818, Corydon died in Exeter, aged 100. In October, 1823, there was living in Portsmouth, a woman of color, whose name was Molly Miles, whose birth was recorded in the parish records of Kittery as occurring in May, 1719.

The errors on the cover to which I alluded, respect the time slavery was abolished in Vermont and this State. It is to the honor of Vermont that it was the first State to abolish slavery, and I will copy from their Constitution, adopted in convention at Windsor, 2d July, 1777, that section by which they expressly and totally excluded slavery from their government. I hope to see in the Magazine, extracts from laws and constitutions, showing the time and manner it was abolished in each of the free States, or at least the New England States. To the extract.

"That all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent, and unalienable rights, among which are the enjoying and defending life and liberty; acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and in pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety. Therefore, no male person, born in this country, or brought from over sea, ought to be holden by law, to serve any person, as a servant, slave, or apprentice, after he arrives to the age of twenty-one years, nor female, in like manner, after she arrives at the age of eighteen years, unless they are bound by their own consent, after they arrive to such age, or bound by law, for the payment of debts, damages, fines, costs, or the like." *Declaration of Rights*, Chap. I. sec. 1.

It appears, therefore, that slavery was virtually abolished in Vermont in 1777, not in 1793. In New Hampshire, it was abolished by the Constitution which was adopted in 1783, and went into effect in June, 1784. In 1792, the Constitution was amended, but there were no alterations of those articles in the Bill of Rights which affected the "natural, essential, and inherent rights" of "ALL MEN." The date, therefore, of the abolishing of slavery in New Hampshire should be 1784.

I trust you will excuse the few facts and corrections which I have given,—and which are communicated with the hope that they may at some time be of use.

I remain, dear sir, your friend and
fellow laborer in the cause
of equal rights,

JOHN FARMER.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

"THE TRIAL OF REUBEN CRANDALL, M. D., charged with publishing seditious libels, by circulating the publications of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY. Before the Circuit Court for the District of Columbia, held at Washington, in April, 1836, occupying the court the period of ten days. New-York, H. R. Piercy, 7 Theatre Alley, 1836." pp. 62.

This prosecution was brought under the common law, and the indictment set forth that the accused was guilty of publishing "malicious and wicked libels, with the intent to excite sedition and insurrection among the slaves and free coloured people of the District." The three counts replied upon give the libellous matter, and it is remarkable that they contain nothing which either possesses more adaptation or argues more intention to excite sedition and insurrection among the slaves than does the Declaration of Independence. We have, then to all intents and purposes, a criminal prosecution in the city of WASHINGTON, against a publisher of the Declaration of Independence! And how does the accused escape punishment? By the inability of the public prosecutor to show that he had ever put in circulation more than a single copy of the seditious bill of rights, and that to an individual who it was not to be supposed would make an improper use of it! But what if he had published? What if he had given his publications, as he had a perfect right to do, to every inhabitant of the District? His liberty or his life would have been the forfeit! There can be no doubt from this trial that the court held the matter charged to be libellous, and the amount of it is that in the District of Columbia the Declaration of Independence is libellous, provided the publisher believes in it. Selling a *freeman for his jail fees*, is no libel—that has no tendency to "excite sedition and insurrection," but to publish the *truth* about it, or make a *picture* of it,—that is a gross libel—a high crime and misdemeanor.

We hope the public will remember that Dr. Crandall lay in jail eight months, in the Federal City, and was brought in jeopardy of his life for holding the sentiments of the Declaration of Independence and lending a publication which aims to enforce them. He has suffered great losses and the sale of his pamphlet ought to some extent to remunerate him.

"SONGS OF THE FREE, and Hymns of Christian Freedom: 'Suited to such as visit at the shrine of Serious Liberty.'—*Percival*. Boston: Isaac Knapp, Washington Street, 1836." pp. 228.

"The devoted friends of Freedom, every where," are under great obligations, if they did but know it, to the talented compiler of this little book, Mrs. M. W. CHAPMAN, nor can they neglect without great ingratitude the laborious, fearless and indefatigable printer and publisher who has taken the best care that good poetry should not be spoiled with bad type. Yet both as an abolitionist and a critic we could wish the book of a more pocketable size. It certainly contains a good pocket-full of Lyrics which to us are the most spirit-stirring in the language, but the bulk of these is, we think, inconveniently increased by others, which, though they may have on the wedding-garment of poetry, are rather dull guests in such company. To two of the hymns we have a more decided objection. We cannot but think that Montgomery did justice neither to himself nor his subject when he

accommodated Moore's delightful melody of Miriam to the First of August, 1834. We dislike these accommodations. Such doings when perpetrated upon true poets, *irritable genius*, are both sacrilegious and piratical. And surely the glorious disenfranchisement of 800,000 slaves is the last jubilee that we would celebrate with a borrowed trumpet. The parody of Heber's incomparable missionary hymn is even worse than the other, for it is *not half done*. But all this notwithstanding, the book is above price, and it is just because we think it so, that we have ventured to point out one or two notes.

"LECTURES ON SLAVERY, by REV. BENJAMIN GODWIN, D. D. *author of Lectures on Atheism.—From the London Edition, with additions, &c.* Boston: James B. Dow. 1836." 12mo. pp. 258.

This is a reprint of one of the ablest and most useful works that were called forth by the abolition discussion in Great Britain. Its arguments hold with all, and perhaps more than all their original force against American Slavery. So far as the lapse of six years has thrown the Lectures behind the circumstances of the present controversy, the deficiency is made up by the valuable notes of the American Editor.—The latter, however, we must say, has not much mended the flaw of the author on the subject of *compensation*. It is a good book.

"THE ENEMIES OF THE CONSTITUTION DISCOVERED, or an inquiry into the origin and tendency of popular violence. Containing a complete and circumstantial account of the unlawful proceedings at the city of Utica, October 21st., 1835: the dispersion of the State Anti-Slavery Convention by the agitators, the destruction of a democratic press, and of the causes which led thereto. Together with a concise treatise on the practice of the court of his honor Judge Lynch. &c., &c. BY DEFENSOR. New-York: Leavitt, Lord & Co., 180 Broadway. G. Tracy, Utica. 1836." 12mo. pp. 183.

This is a very full and circumstantial and we may add correct account, from the pen of a disinterested eye witness, of one of the most alarming, and disgraceful outrages which liberty ever suffered in our country.

"LECTURES OF GEORGE THOMPSON, with a full report of the discussion between Mr. Thompson and Mr. Borthwick, the proslavery agent, held at the Royal Amphitheatre, Liverpool, Eng. and which continued for six evenings with unabated interest: compiled from various English Editions. Also a brief history of his connexion with the Anti Slavery cause in England. By WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. Boston, published by Isaac Knapp, 1836." 12mo. pp. 190.

Whoever has listened to the rapturous, impetuous, cataract eloquence of George Thompson, will not so much wonder that his reporters have failed fairly to write him down, as that they did not give up in utter despair. These speeches are not George Thompson; yet, like pictures of rainbows, forked lightning, and the starry concave, there is something of glory in them which will do very well till you compare them with the original. We remember that before we heard our friend lecture, or dreamed of his coming to this country, we used to wonder whether his printed controversy with Borthwick were not an improvement upon the spoken one. We advise the American public, for their own credit, first to buy the book and then recall the man.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.

ANTI-SLAVERY.—100 new Societies have been added to the list during the last quarter. The State Society of Ohio celebrated its anniversary on the 27th of April in a noble spirit. It resolved to raise \$10,000 during the year, \$4,500 of which was pledged on the spot. The American Society had a most animating anniversary in New-York on the 10th May. It will endeavor to raise \$50,000 during the year. The subscriptions amounted to \$21,000. The New England Convention met in Boston on the 24th May—a multitudinous, high-souled, never tiring assembly of fearless men and women. Subscriptions were made to the amount of about \$7,000. The hardy yeomanry of New Hampshire celebrated their state anniversary on the 2d of June and subscribed more than \$1,200 to help forward the good cause. Abolitionism has *more than doubled*, in one year, under the 'death blows' of its enemies.

FREE STATE LEGISLATION.—Maine, Connecticut, New-York and Ohio have resolutionized the spirit of Anti-Slavery to hold its peace. Massachusetts had a set of Anti-Abolition resolutions reported for adoption, and Rhode Island a *gag law*. Both were *indefinitely postponed*. In the one case the abolitionists were heard and their opponents were glad to retreat in silence; in the other, they were invited to plead their cause, but when the day came, the advocates of gag-law threw down their "bill" and ran. The Committee to whom the subject was referred in the legislature of Pennsylvania brought in a report worthy of freedom. They asserted the right, in the most unqualified terms, to discuss slavery and to endeavor to abolish it in the District of Columbia. There was, of course, proslavery enough in the legislature to postpone this report. In the mean time the people of Pennsylvania will have an opportunity to ruminate upon it.

CONGRESSIONAL.—The Post Office censorship bill passed to its third reading by the casting vote of the Vice President, but was finally lost by a majority of 25 to 19. The grand sedative movement, in the House of Representatives, at the head of which Mr. Pinckney of South Carolina was placed, has resulted in a violation of the Constitution, by which *the right of petition is prostrated*.

ARKANSAS.—Has come into this Union with a mill-stone around her neck. Her constitution forbids the abolition of slavery. The crime was committed silently. The representatives of the people were made sensible that a slaveholder sat in the Speaker's chair. Ex-President Adams had the floor, the question being before the House on the passage of the bill. Little did it avail him, for even after fairly recognizing his right to the floor, the Speaker permitted the gag of the "previous question" to be applied, and was sustained by the House!!

TEXAS.—The victory of Houston, has rejoiced this nation as the bullock is rejoiced at the corn which toles him to the slaughter-house. If we think that Mexico and the free nations will let their swords peacefully rust in their scabbards while we are making six slave states on the soil of a sister republic, it is only another proof how blind God can make a people whom He pleases to punish.

INDEX.

ABOLITION, advance of, 102, 310, 416.
 " by Great Britain, 3, 107.
 " in New Hampshire, 413.
 " in Vermont, 413.
 " in Mexico, 194.
 " of Slave Trade, 11.
 Abolitionists, immediate, 1.
 Abraham, 32, 128.
 Abstinence from slave products, 393.
 African Repository, 53.
 Agitation, 343.
 Agriculture, 289.
 Alvord, Mr. 311.
 Amalgamation, 166, 174.
 American Bible Society, 54.
 Amis des Noirs, 243, 248.
 Andrapodistes, 88.
 Antigua, 100, 102, 114, 206, 309.
 Anti-Slavery Society, of London, 15, 107, 409.
 Apprenticeship, 100, 114.
 Archæology, 71.
 Aristocracy, 186, 345.
 Aristotle, 3.
 Arkansas, 416.
 " Gazette, 194.
 Asbury, 63, 64.
 August 1st, 1834, 100, 114.
 Austin, Stephen F., 196, 203.
 Baldwin, Edward, 108.
 Ball, Charles, 375.
 Baptist, Southern, 152.
 Beet sugar, 398.
 Benton, Thos. H., 201.
 Bermuda, 114.
 Biassou, 261.
 Bible Society, Am., 54.
 Birney, Jas. G., 115, 310.
 Black Republic, 263.
 Blackstone, Sir Wm., 283.
 Blair, Wm. T., 108.
 Blasphemy, 79.
 Bloodhounds, 302.
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, 141, 184.
 Boyer, 275, 282, 304.
 Brougham, Lord, 112, 212.
 Brown, Moses, 115, 162.
 Brown University, 152.
 Burchell, Mr., 110.
 Burke, 212, 330.
 Burnet, David G., 193.
 Butler, Col., 198.
 Buxton, Thos. F., 111, 112, 133, 206.
 By-ends, Mr., 159.

Cæsar, Julius, 214.
 Calhoun, Mr. 311.
 Canning, Mr., 14, 15, 212.
 Cape Francois, 261, 290.
 Caste, 4, 56, 315.
 Castlereagh, Lord, 10, 11.
 Ceremonial Law, 80.
 Chaining, 378.
 Channing, Dr. 207, 341, 372.
 Chateau Blond, 291.
 Chavannes, 250, 256.
 Child, David Lee, 193.
 CHRIST and his Apostles, 358, 372.
 Christian Communion, 344.
 Christian Spectator, 341.
 "Christian Slaveholder," 20, 26, 34, 65, 367.
 Christmas, 102.
 Christophe, 303.
 CHRIST'S Kingdom; 210.
 Church Union, 110.
 Civilization, advanced by slavery, 219.
 Civil offences of slaves, 120.
 Clarkson, Thomas, 8, 62, 305, 397.
 Clay, Thomas S., 98, 117.
 Clothing of slaves, 96, 99.
 Coahuila, 193.
 Coalition of mulattoes and negroes, 259.
 Code agricultural, 133.
 Code rural, 270, extracts, 276, review of, 278—282.
 Codfish, 9.
 Coke, Dr., 63, 64.
 Coleridge, 62, 169.
 Colleges, 50.
 Colonial Assembly, 248.
 Colonization Society, 46, 53, 222.
 Commerce of Hayti, 269, 298, 304.
 Commercial Advertiser, 275.
 Compensation, 113, 114, 235, 415.
 Complexion, 3, 216.
 Concordat, 252, 259.
 Congress, 312, 416.
 Conscience, 145, 147, 149.
 Consequences, 1, 3, 170.
 Constitution, 166, 182, 218, 237, 407.
 " enemies of, discovered, 415.
 Coomba, 258.
 Cotton, 94, 192.
 Coup de grace, 256.
 Crandall, Dr. R., 414.
 Crimes and punishments, 119.
 Crothers, Rev. Samuel, 68, 162.
 Cruelty, 118, 126, 246, 256, 302, 318.

- Cul de Sac, 266.
 Danger of emancipation, 231.
 Decrees of French National Assembly, 247, 251, 259.
 Definition of Slavery, 223, 355, 358.
 Dessalines, 273.
 Dewdney, Edmond, 103.
 Dew, Professor, 211, 226.
 Digneron, 296.
 Disabilities of colored men, 41.
 District of Columbia, 203, 219, 312, 348.
 Driver, 117.
 Doddridge, Dr., 361.
 Dumornay Bellevue, 295.
 Dupuis, Mr., 4.
 Dwellings of slaves, 99.
 Ecclesiastical defenders of slavery, 341.
 Education, anti-republican, 171.
 Edwards, Bryan, 242.
 Edwards, Jonathan, 49.
 Emancipation, immediate, 3, 100, 107, 114, 231, 342.
 " ruinous to masters, 236.
 England, 4, 184.
 English laws and Haytian, 283.
 Equality, natural, 370.
 Escape, perils of, 392.
 Excitement, 239.
 Exegesis, 361.
 Expediency, 18, 168, 170.
 Farmer, John, 412.
 Fear, 97, 244.
 Female Anti-Slavery Society of Boston, 207, 208.
 Female influence, 173.
 Female sex, effect of slavery on, 220, 390.
 Ferrand de Beaudierre, 247.
 Feudal system, 6.
 Fleming, Admiral, 299.
 Flogging of women, 16, 335.
 Florida Treaty, 197.
 Food, 28, 96, 98, 391.
 Foreign Intelligence, 100, 205, 309, 409.
 Foreign interference, 184.
 Forgery, 274.
 Franklin, James, 271.
 Free blacks, 189, 223, 245.
 Fugitive, life of a, 375.
 Gag law, 181, 312.
 Galbaud, Gov., 261.
 Galveston Bay and Texas Land Co. 193.
 Garden, Alexander, 308.
 Gascoigne, Gen., 10.
 Georgia, 218.
 " and the Cherokees, 329.
 Gholson, Mr., 202.
 Gilmore, Mary, 216.
 Godwin, Dr. Benj., 415.
 Goodell, Wm., 21, 162, 171.
 Gradualism, 13, 18, 100, 107, 240.
 Grand Jury of St. Louis, 404.
 Greece, superiority of, 3.
 Green, Beriah, 34, 156.
 Gregoire, Abbe, 259.
 Grenville, Lord, 11.
 Guerrero, Pres., 197.
 Guilt of slavery, 147, 325.
 Gurley, Mr., 53.
 Hall, Bishop, 168.
 "Hard language," 59.
 Harmony of the Old and New Testaments, 71.
 Hartley, Mr. David, 8.
 Harvey's Sketches, 303.
 Hawkins, Sir John, 7.
 Hayti, (See St. Domingo.)
 Haytian agriculture, 289, 297.
 " domestic habits, 294.
 " manners, 289.
 " traveler, 287.
 " University, 304.
 Helots, 363.
 Heyrick, Elizabeth, 12.
 Hibbert, Mr., 275.
 Hindostan, castes of, 4.
 Holland, Edwin C., 93.
 Hooker, (Richard,) 160.
 Hospitals for slaves, 96.
 Idleness of Haytians, 284.
 Ignorance, 346.
 Immediatism, 13, 100, 107, 111, 113, 231, 240.
 Indemnity, Haytian, 305.
 Indians, 205, 220.
 Influence of slavery on masters, 130, 226.
 Inginac, 282.
 Innes, Mr., 206.
 Inquirer, an, 40.
 Inquiry, in Parliament, 111, 206.
 Instruction, oral, 128.
 Insurrection, 109, 110, 252.
 Irrigation, 288.
 Jahn, 71.
 Jail fees, 219.
 Jamaica, 5, 16, 100, 109, 410.
 Jay, William, 210.
 Jealousy, 258.
 Jean Francois, 261.
 Jefferson, 6, 202.
 Jewish servitude, 32, 358.
 Jones, Mr., 132.
 Judicial law, 78.
 Kennon, 63.
 Knibb, Rev. Wm. 110, 111.
 La Croix, Gen. 267.
 Ladies Associations, 108.
 Lafayette, 242, 249.
 Lawless, Judge, *vs.* Law, 490.
 Laws of slavery, 22.
 " of war, 213.
 Le Clerc, 300, 301.
 L'Espinasse, 296.
 Legislation, 171, 416.

- Lerebour, Gen. 291.
 Letter of Alex. Garden, 308.
 " of John Farmer, Esq. 412.
 " of Oge, 254.
 " to a Minister of the Gospel, 333.
 " to Rev. Paul Tentmaker, D.D. 366.
 Letters of Sullivan, 171.
 Libel, 184, 414.
 License to drive a cart, 41.
 Literary and Theol. Review, 34, 156.
 Longevity of colored people, 192, 413.
 Louisiana, 200, 369.
 Lundy, Benj. 204.
 Macaulay, Zachary, 108.
 Macaya, 262.
 Mackau, Baron, 305.
 Mackenzie, Consul Gen. 133, 304.
 Madden, Dr. 412.
 Magazine, Quarterly, 3.
 Maitland, Gen. 141.
 Malenfant, 140, 265.
 Mancenille, massacre of, 302.
 " Manner," 230.
 Man-stealing, 27.
 Marcy, Gov. 311.
 Marechausee, 245.
 Marriage of slaves, 117.
 Marshall, John, 306.
 Maryland, 246, 381.
 Massachusetts, 312.
 Mauduit, Col. 248.
 Maxim of Mr. Woods, 57.
 M'Duffie, Gov., 203, 208.
 M'Intosh, roasted alive, 403.
 Messenger, gospel, 128.
 Methodism and slavery, 64.
 Mexico, 194.
 Military guards, 272, 281.
 Missionaries, 110, 111.
 Mobs, 172, 311, 403.
 Mogedore, 4.
 Moquet, 289.
 Morality of slavery, 225.
 Moral Law, 72.
 Moral Science, 143.
 Moses and the apostles, 68.
 Mulattoes, 244, 249.
 Mulgrave, Lord, 111.
 Names, hard, 2.
 Neander, 43.
 "Negro friend" associations, 19, 108.
 Nevis, 116.
 Non-Conformists, 160.
 Non-resistance, 93.
 Notices of new publications, 207, 414.
 Objections tested, 227.
 Oge, 249, 250, 252, 254, 305.
 Old Testament, 68, 70.
 Oneida Institute, 312.
 Orators, anti-slavery, 174.
 Orpen, Dr. Chas. E. W. 108.
 Paganism, 90.
 Paley, Archdeacon, 145, 358, 372.
 Patches for slaves, 96, 98, 368.
 Patricians, 4.
 Paul, the apostle, 155, 177, 333, 366.
 Peace societies, 183.
 Pennock, Mr. 12.
 Pennsylvania, 7.
 Penn, Wm. 43.
 Phelps, Mr. 311.
 Philemon, 367.
 Physical expedients, 398.
 Piety—unhuman and inhuman, 338.
 Piracy, 27, 217, 313.
 Pitt, Wm., 9, 212.
 Plan of Abolition, 233.
 Plebeians, 4.
 Pliability, 66.
 Poinsett, Mr. 197.
 Poland, serfs of, 224.
 Political Class Book, 171, 181.
 Politics vs. Religion, 209.
 Polverel 133, 140, 260, his proclamation
 of freedom, 264.
 Polygamy, 127.
 Popery, 79.
 Population, 188, 243, 305.
 Port au Prince, 287, 290.
 Prejudice, 5, 41.
 Preparation for emancipation, 230.
 Presbyterian church, 368.
 President of the U. S., 204, 311.
 Price of slaves, 202.
 Priest and Levite, 166.
 Priestley, Mr. 22.
 Products of slave labor, 393.
 Property in man, 23, 93, 300, 356.
 Pro-slavery argument, 355.
 " testimony, 92, 117.
 Protection of slaves, 29.
 Protestants, 5.
 Public sentiment 44, 156.
 Pulpit and slavery, 333.
 Punishments, 119, 125, 137, 246, 276, 277,
 282.
 Quarterly Magazine, 3.
 Radical, the, 160.
 Radicalism, 47, 156.
 Red sea, 157.
 Reform 34, 37.
 Reformer, functions of, 39, 160.
 Religious privileges, 128, 309, 353, 369, 386.
 Repertory, Biblical, 341, 368.
 Repository, African, 53.
 Republicanism, 401, 408.
 Review, 34, 143, 171, 341, 375.
 Revolution, 37.
 Rhode Island, 310, 312.
 Rice, Mr., 116.
 Rights, 24, 75, 105, 123, 150, 187, 237.
 Rifland L. and M., 108.
 Robbery, 2, 27, 217, 218 of the post of-
 fice, 328.

- Rochambeau, 302.
 Rome, republican, 4.
 Rose, Mr., 10.
 Rural police, 281.
 Sabbath, 371, 386.
 Santhonax, 141, 260.
 Saville, Sir George, 8.
 Schimmelpennies, M. A., 108.
 Scoble, John, 115.
 Scripture argument, 68, 154, 355, 360.
 Seabrook, Hon. W. B. 93, 122.
 Shares, cultivation for, 136, 279.
 Sharp, Granville, 4, 8, 207.
 Sheffield, Lord, 9.
 Sick slaves, 96, 99.
 Sidmouth, Lord, 10.
 Sirr, Major, 108.
 Slaveholders, 5.
 " in the church, 364.
 Slave population, 188.
 Slavery, 6, tested 21, 88, by Roman law,
 90, 153, sources of, 213, 215, 217, 218,
 defined, 228, 355, 358.
 Slaves, Roman, 214, better off than free,
 232, would starve if emancipated, 232,
 would overrun us, 234.
 Slave trade, 7, 8, intercolonial, 12, in St.
 Domingo, 244, internal, 199, 222, 313.
 Sligo, Marquis of, 412.
 Smith, Gerrit, 162, 393.
 Songs of the free, 414.
 Southampton Massacre, 211.
 South Carolina, 25, 94, 218, 383, 401.
 Stanley, Lord, 112.
 Stanley, Mr., 9, 11.
 Statistics, 188, 412.
 St. Domingo, 4, 133, 241, horrors of, 243,
 deputies from, 246, population of, 243,
 305, insurrection in, 252, secret his-
 tory, 257, invasion by British, 263, ex-
 ports, 269, 298, division of land, 285.
 Stephen, George, 108, 111.
 St. Kitts, 7.
 St. Louis Observer, 406.
 Stocks, a punishment, 125.
 Storrs, Rev. Geo., 311.
 Stuart, Charles, 3, 63, 107, 108.
 Stumbles, Mrs. 116.
 Subsistence, 28, 96, 98, 391.
 Suffield, Lord, 111.
 Sugar, 101, 192, 310, 410. Beet 398.
 Sullivan, T. R., 171.
 Sullivan, Wm. L.L.D., 171, 181.
 Summary of events, 207, 416.
 Sutherland, Robt., 299.
 Symbols, 82.
 Synod, of S. C. and Ga., 130.
 Tasks, 95, 99, 371.
 Temperance, 157, 178.
 Testimony, pro-slavery, 92, 117.
 Texas, 193, 314, 382, 416.
 Theft, 2, 27.
 Thompson, Andrew, 108.
 Thompson, George, 63, 108, 115, 184, 415.
 Time of labor, 95.
 Toussaint, L'Ouverture, 140, 143, 266, 301.
 Townsend, Lucy, 108.
 Travers, Walter, 163.
 Treatment of slaves, 33, 118, 381.
 Turnbull, Robt. J., 94.
 Turning loose, 234.
 Types and symbols, 80.
 Tyranny, Domestic, 390.
 "Union will be divided," 238.
 Upshur, Judge, 202.
 Utica convention, 207.
 "Vigintial crop," 200.
 Vincent, Gen., 141, 267.
 Virginia, 7, 109, 211, 381.
 Vituperation, 229.
 Vote on abolition of slave trade, 11.
 Wages, 29, 101, 140, 389.
 Walton, Isaac, 157, 160.
 War, effects of, 268.
 Washington, Gen., 63, 64.
 Watson, Alderman, 9.
 Watson, Methodist, 111.
 Wayland, Dr., 143, 348, 372.
 Wellington, Duke of, 17.
 Western Reserve College, 53.
 West Indies, 7, 100, 309, 409.
 Wesley, 63, 64.
 Whip, 16, 134, 282, 312, 313, 384.
 Whipping, 51.
 Whitefield, 307.
 Whites, 3, 4, 214, 216.
 Whitgift, Archbishop, 163.
 Wilberforce, 8, 9.
 Wilson, Edward, 108.
 Wisner, Dr., 370.
 Woods, Mr., 35, 39, vs. Jeremiah, 51,
 156.
 "Working condition," 122.
 Yerbury, Rebecca, 108.
 Yorkinos, 198.
 Young, Sir W., 10.
 Zong, the slave ship, 122.